The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

MARCH has come in like a lamb, but everybody expects that before it ends there will have been lion-like and maybe decisive happenings. *Where* is another matter, but we all expect to hear one morning when we wake news comparable to Hitler's attack on Russia or the Anglo-American invasion of North Africa—news that may make these brief comments sadly out of date when they are read. For a moment the onward march of the Russians seems to be halted, but if they do no more, what a marvellous achievement has been theirs this winter! The German propaganda is a good barometer: at first Haw-haw sneered at the capture by the Russians of places "even the B.B.C. admit they can't find on the map—just one or two huts and a frozen pond"; now night after night he calls Europe to save civilization—and Christianity, forsooth!—from the Bolshevik hordes. If there is so little that we can do to help the oppressed and starving people—Jews and others—do the Germans really think by shrieking about the Russians that they can blot out from our minds the long and sanguinary story of their murders and tortures? How much farther the Russians can advance before the Allies strike is a point on which no one will dare to prophesy. If the United Nations can maintain the initiative and the element of surprise, even the advantage of interior lines of communication will be overcome. For a moment in Tunisia it looked as if the Allies were reverting to the bad old ways, as if they were really thinking Rommel would do nothing at all, but just wait until we were ready to attack. That moment has passed, but there will be general relief when North Africa is cleared of the enemy. Much that is still mysterious to the ordinary observer may then be made clear; but this is no time for anyone whose loyalty to the Allied cause is suspect to be in a position where he can sabotage the efforts of the fighting men and jeopardize many lives.

Before our next issue the world will have seen war on its most gigantic scale. That is the one thing that is certain. May it be given to the leaders of the United Nations so to deploy their moral and material forces that the peoples of the Axis lands may realize that further strife is hopeless, cast off their leaders, and sue for peace. Meanwhile those of us whose lives are given to us daily at the cost of the lives of the young and the brave, must work, watch, and pray as never before, wasting nothing, and wanting nothing

for ourselves, determined only to make a new world in which youth will never again be called upon to make the sacrifice implied in "19 of our bombers did not return".

Meanwhile we cannot forget the Chinese people, struggling so heroically against their oppressor. Ere long the way will be opened for adequate help to be furnished to them, the help they have so richly merited. It would be well to follow up the Parliamentary mission to China by other missions representing different sections of the community.

* * *

PROF. T. E. JESSOP'S *The Treaty of Versailles: Was It Just?* (Nelson, 5s.) uncomfortably reminds us of years in which we let good intentions serve for hard thinking, deceived by

> German propaganda playing with calculated perversion on the uninformed and intellectually lazy idealism of the British public . . . we lost all political perspective; our counterfeit generosity, flourishing on ignorance and duped by propaganda disguised as information, closed our eyes and hearts to the rights and needs of the nations which Germany had ruthlessly and impenitently mishandled.

Shall we make the same mistake after this war, when Germany again begins to "organize sympathy"? Will the starving people and children whom Germany has oppressed ("The Germans will not go hungry", said Goering) have to wait until the Germans have been succoured? Prof. Jessop does not minimize the mistakes of the Treaty, but, like Sir Alfred Zimmern before him, he places it in perspective, and shows it was a not inconsiderable achievement. And of its greatest enactment he coins the epigram, "It was the Nations that failed, and not the League".

Because Miss Vera Brittain's letters to her son of fifteen in the United States—*Humiliation with Honour* (Dakers, 3s. 6d.)—entirely fails to recognize the force of the argument Prof. Jessop sets forth, they left us quite cold, but with the uneasy feeling that some good people have learnt nothing, and that the same mistakes *may* be made again. What *has* Miss Brittain to say about these vigorous words of one who, be it remembered, is the author of *Law and Love*?

> Through this impoverishment we of Britain (to speak now only of ourselves) thought that good intentions could do the work of strong will, and gobbled up propaganda instead of submitting to the discipline of sound education. We all claimed the right to advise and bully whatever government was in power, without troubling ourselves much to learn the actual nature of the motley world we were living in. In one breath we insisted on the full discharge of our international obligations under the League, the boycott of Japan, rigid sanctions against Italy, firm resistance to Germany; in the next breath

> we declared that we would never go to war again, and refused to vote money for the strengthening of our fighting forces—to the relief, delight, and profit of Japan and Italy and Germany. Disarmed to below our 1914 level, we made ourselves incapable of helping those who rightly looked to us for help. We imagined that we were living in a world in which force had ceased to count, when it was counting more than ever. We blinded ourselves to the dreadful truth, because it was dreadful, that, in the words of Oscar Wilde, "there is only one thing worse than Injustice, and that is Justice without her sword in her hand". Only bigger men than we are can make this untrue.

* * *

To the general relief Mr. Gandhi has survived his fast, and we cannot help but ask of him the question, *"Cui bono?"* The Government of India has had universal sympathy in the unhappy dilemma in which this attempted blackmail had placed it. Mr. Gandhi could not have been released unconditionally without the release of all his friends, many of whom clearly are not willing to limit their opposition to the Government to non-violent measures, and the whole Dominion might thus have been laid open to invasion and incalculable suffering. Recently an Indian, Mr. T. A. Raman, has asked the question, *What Does Gandhi Want?* (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.). His answer is:

> independence to be non-violent, to avoid participation in the war, to stop the war if possible, to resist the Japanese if necessary, but only with non-violent methods.

His own attitude is indicated by the motto from the *Bhagavad Gita* on the title-page, "But if thou wilt not carry on this righteous warfare, then wilt thou, casting away thine own duty and thine honour, incur sin", and by the dedication:

> To Mahatma Gandhi. To you whose lofty faith and impatient purpose is now leading India, which is so much your debtor, to her own and the world's jeopardy, this faithful collection of your words is dedicated with sorrow and affection.

The whole situation leaves Christian men and women profoundly unhappy. Their first task is to attempt to comprehend it, and not content themselves with superficial knowledge and easy generalizations. They will find great help in Prof. R. Coupland's *The Indian Problem, 1833-1935* (Oxford Press, 6s.), which leaves us with only one regret—that a short-sighted regulation prevents residents in Britain from sending copies—and with it copies of Dr. Ernest Barker's *Britain*—to friends in the United States. Sir Stafford Cripps's mission to India did much to educate American opinion, but comparatively few Americans are aware of the history outlined in Prof. Coupland's book—the first volume of a Report

on the Constitutional Problem in India prepared for Nuffield College. Ever since the Beit Professor's masterly life of Wilberforce, we have eagerly seized on anything he has written: Dr. Coupland seems able to make even dry bones live, and his gifts are seen to advantage in this survey, which we commend to all our readers. They may care to search for an unusual phenomenon in an Oxford book—a misprint: is there any psychological significance in the fact that "laid" becomes "raid"? We have to admit, however, that the more we read of Congress propaganda, the more baffled we become.

Prof. N. Gangulee's *Constituent Assembly of India* (Allen & Unwin, 16s.) left us as despondent as did a conversation with Mr. Gandhi in 1931; from beginning to end there is no recognition of the existence of liberalism in Britain, or of any contribution at all the occupation of India has made to its people; every action of the British Government is regarded with suspicion, merely another "of the Machiavellian designs of a powerful alien democracy", and no credit is ever given for sincerity. Prof. Gangulee demands "freedom to achieve freedom", a constituent assembly of India's "freely chosen representatives": having complained that Britain has kept India illiterate he has to argue that the illiterate who will elect the Assembly are "endowed with a fund of common sense"! There is an amazing lack of realism throughout: let the Indian people have independence and the right to frame their own constitution ("Sovereign independence is derived from the people and political sovereignty can never be a gift: it has to be gained through struggle"), and apparently all will be well: at once the Moslem lion will lie down with the Hindu lamb and the Japanese aggressor send a bouquet! In Mr. Gandhi's words, "the burden of solving the tangle rests not on Britain, but on the Constituent Assembly". Apparently a problem which has baffled the people politically most educated will yield to the Congress magic wand: but, of course, Prof. Gangulee argues that Britain has failed because she had deliberately fomented division, and her aim has been to remain in India for gain. India must "cut away from the financial domination of the City of London", says Prof. Gangulee. Economic nationalism we hoped was becoming a back-number, but we hope it will not prevent Britain coming to India's help when she is starving!

It ought to be said that the argument is placed against the background of a study of Constituent Assemblies in North America, France, the British Empire, Ireland, Russia, Turkey, Germany, and Spain, and that there is a useful Appendix of documents. In such a wide survey it is easy to err, and sometimes we wanted to question the history and check the dates. There is an unfortunate "Gold" for "God" in the Declaration of Independence, and

misprints on pp. 14, 17, and 216n. In some way or other the Government must recover the initiative which it possessed when the Cripps mission was despatched. How it can do this does not at the moment appear. In two timely pamphlets, *The Indian Deadlock* and *Can Indians Unite?* (Livingstone Press, 3d. each), the Rev. Norman Goodall stresses the responsibility resting upon Christians, and especially Christians in India. The present *impasse* may yield to the influence of Christian personality when all else fails: perhaps had C. F. Andrews been alive Mr. Gandhi would have been dissuaded from his fast. Perhaps even at this late hour an approach to Mr. Gandhi by Lord Halifax might give the opportunity of a new start. Or is it that Mr. Gandhi and the Congress leaders are convinced that the Prime Minister is still opposed to Indian independence and therefore consider the Cripps offer insincere? If that is the case, it should not be beyond the wit of man to find a way to their hearts—and heads.

In this connexion we did an injustice to the Prime Minister in our last issue, and to the Secretary of State for India as well. In a reference to Mr. Amery's recently published speeches we said that Mr. Churchill had added to his difficulties by appointing as Secretary of State for India one who like himself had opposed the India Act. This was incorrect, and we are concerned to make the facts as widely known as possible. As a matter of fact, Mr. Amery consistently supported the India Act against Mr. Churchill both in the House of Commons and at meetings of the Conservative Party. In view of this, it is significant that the Prime Minister, in spite of his own previous attitude, should have appointed one who was known to be strongly in sympathy with Indian national aspirations. Mr. Amery's own speeches show that his main outlook has not changed, and we hope it may be given to him to find a happy and peaceful solution to a problem which has for so long baffled some of the astutest minds of our time. If he succeeds, the Prime Minister who appointed him will assuredly deserve his share of the credit.

* * *

THE much-debated Beveridge Report is on the desk before us. With its Appendix it makes 550 pages, and we are inclined to wonder how many of those who have talked about it, in Parliament and outside, have read it. From the Parliamentary reports, it would scarcely seem that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had done so, for he seemed to imply that the Report failed to meet the problem of how its recommendations were to be financed. It is now trite to say that the Government had a better case than their spokesmen presented—it could have been made crystal clear that they accepted the main recommendations, but had to place them in relation to the general social and economic situation. Had the

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

first Government speakers been able to speak with earnestness and even passion the way would have been easy—but Sir John Anderson, Sir Kingsley Wood, Lord Simon! But where was the man who could have made the Commons glow with a vision of men and women with the burden of want lifted from their shoulders? Mr. Harold Macmillan might have done it, but he was in North Africa. Perhaps Mr. Ernest Brown might, or Mr. Tom Johnston. Anyhow, the Government will surely have learnt the lesson that the method of presenting a case is not unimportant.

Perhaps they were unfortunate in that the debate came when the tide of war had already turned. But is it not a sobering and disquieting reflection that as soon as a gleam of light came from the end of the tunnel signs of party strife appeared? The vested interests in the Catering Trade showed that no detail like national unity in time of danger must stand in their way, and the Labour M.P.s could not resist the temptation to show *their* independence a few days later.

If this is to happen when danger is removed, what is the outlook for the future, when the problems of peace, as complex and intricate as those of war, have to be faced? If within a country divisions are to appear, how will the United Nations, with their varied and conflicting interests, hold together?

The most remarkable fact about the Beveridge debate was not in Parliament at all: it was to be found in the vigorous, even enthusiastic, support of the proposals in the editorial columns of *The Times,* where the Government's handling of the situation was severely criticized. And the verdict of *The Times* on the Report cannot be bettered:

> The plain truth is that Sir William Beveridge has succeeded in crystallizing the vague but keenly felt aspirations of millions of people concerning their economic security in the world after the war in a shape which commends itself as being practical and businesslike. He has produced, not a masterpiece of original thought, but a workmanlike synthesis of the considered views of a large number of organizations with first-hand experience of our outstanding social needs. He has outlined his proposals with enviable clarity and supported them with balanced and cogent reasoning.

This from *The Times,* which has continued its advocacy since the debate, while on the date these words are written it has published an article on "National Economic Policy", suggesting that security of employment might be assured were employers to make long-term contracts with regard to labour as they do in respect of land, buildings, and plant, and not only so, but that the State should become a third party to contracts of employment and carry the employee through intervals of unemployment at full pay. This is our old

friend "Work or Maintenance", now proclaimed not on Left platforms but on the centre page of *The Times*. Indeed "it moves".

And not only *The Times*. The two Archbishops have declared in favour of the Beveridge proposals. In fact, the Archbishops are now standing where John Clifford and Silvester Horne stood thirty years ago and saying what they said! And the Roman Catholic Bishop of Münster, in his plea for the independence of the Church, is almost quoting verbatim the words of John Penry, whom the Archbishop of Canterbury of his day hounded to death 350 years ago. Without doubt "it moves".

* * *

THE Church of Christ, even more than the Government, needs to consider constantly the presentation of its case—the finest case ever entrusted to human beings. Sadly we have to confess that somehow the Church has failed convincingly to present the good news to the peoples of the world, so much so that now for millions the Church and its message have ceased to be relevant. What is to be done? Some say, "Back to the past". But the repetition of creeds in which we do not believe—what straining of consciences there must be Sunday by Sunday—and conformity to practices which have ceased to have meaning, will never impress men: only sincerity can do that in the long run.

We often wonder whether preachers emphasize enough the marvel of worship, the fact that "Far round the world Thy people sing their song", that as Sunday dawns round the globe, everywhere it wakes men to sing God's praise. The church spire rising from village after village seen as the train speeds along our English countryside should move our hearts unless they have become cold and unresponsive. In a bitter January week last year we travelled by train from Halifax to Montreal. There was heavy snow and constant delay, so that we had to spend an extra night in the train. The Maritimes may look beautiful in summer, but then they presented an uninviting picture: but there was one redeeming feature: never were we long out of sight of a church; wherever there was a cluster of houses there was a building which stood for the worship of God. These pages have often dilated on the way buildings have tended to become a bane to the Church rather than a benefit. It is only right therefore that we should acknowledge the thrill and warming of heart the sight of these churches brought.

In almost every country of the world they are to be found, and the traveller rejoices to realize that he can find a spiritual home wherever he goes. Often the worship varies little from that to which he is accustomed; at other times a novel type of worship makes a powerful appeal. One of the Communion Services which have meant most to us in our lives was in Amsterdam in an Eng-

lish Church. Our interpreter, one of the interpreters at the Versailles Conference, had recently been converted from Judaism to Anglicanism. Late one night he brought the Anglican padre in to see us, and asked if we might start work a little later in the morning so that he might attend an early celebration (he was acting as caretaker of the church out of the goodness of his heart). We agreed, and he said, "Perhaps you would like to come to the celebration". We looked at the padre, saying, "That isn't for us to say". We were told we should be very welcome, and next morning the communicants in that Anglican church were a converted Jew and two Congregational ministers. And to one of them at least never had the Church seemed more real, and the presence of angels, archangels, and the whole company of heaven a manifestation of the One Church, militant and triumphant. In public worship, despite all its varied forms, in the catholicity of our hymnbooks and the harmony of our praise, rather than in the attempt to distort our minds in accommodation to obsolete categories, is the Church's true unity, and herein is an aspect of its witness, often overlooked, which the masses of men may find impressive.

* * *

On April 6th, 1593, Henry Barrow and John Greenwood were executed; on May 29th, John Penry, finest of all Welshmen, met his end, leaving a wife and four little girls, the eldest only four years old. What does the world know about them and their witness? What does the Church know? What do Congregationalists? Three and a half centuries ago they died for the cause for which the world is at war today: the story of their adventures in the seven years from 1586 to 1593 is one of the most thrilling in the history of the Church. Penry's life-story would make a magnificent film, and it may be—but we anticipate.

For the last twelve months it has been our task to decipher the note-book Penry kept in prison before his death. Now reposing in the Huntington Library in California with many of the papers relevant to his trial, it has waited all these years for one who would take the time and trouble to decipher it. Soon it will see the light, and then Congregationalists and Welshmen will be reminded what manner of man Penry was, and give God thanks for his loyalty, courage and devotion. Here is the beginning of a petition he sent to Burghley:

> As I do not, Rt. Hon. and my very good Lord in the testimony which the Eternal my God hath committed unto my hands regard either the fear of favour of any flesh, but only the eye of my God . . .

And here are words from another document, addressed to the Queen, found in his study and used against him at his trial:

> As touching your land and Kingdom although next under our God we acknowledge it to be yours by virtue and place: yet notwithstanding we are to make it known unto men that the Church of God is not tenant in any Kingdom at the will of any prince or state: but shall be there in spite of all the princes and states under heaven as long as the Lord Jesus pleaseth.

If the message of these early Independents had been heeded, how much suffering and bloodshed would mankind have escaped! We ought to proclaim their story to the world so that not even the Bishops or the Brains Trust could be ignorant of their existence. We were tempted to make this number entirely historical, so many are the anniversaries to be commemorated—the centenary of the Disruption and of the formation of the Evangelical Union in Scotland, of the transference of Lancashire College to Manchester, to say nothing of the early Independents, who deserve the whole issue. But the historically minded will have to be content with Dr. Murphy's article and with references in other places.

* * *

In our next issue we hope to print an article in which two of the outstanding Congregational theologians—and two of the acutest minds—of the last generation have a share. It is a paper on "The Authority of the Cross" read by Dr. Robert Mackintosh in 1906. The discussion on the paper was to have been opened by Dr. P. T. Forsyth. Prevented by illness from speaking, Forsyth asked for the manuscript, and returned it with annotations and comments. Dr. Mackintosh placed the annotated manuscript in our hands many years ago. We are confident that our readers will agree that it has not only historic interest, but is not without its significance for modern thought.

* * *

The long expected Education Bill has not yet seen the light. It will undoubtedly contain proposals regarding the raising of the school age, continuation schools, and other delayed reforms. Here we trust the President will receive the solid support of Christians. Will the proposals in regard to religious education be such that they will receive like support? We wish we could think so, and shall be relieved if they do not revive ancient controversies. It almost looks as if they will not be even a second best. Best of all would it be if the President could say, "The Churches have intimated to me that they do not desire the Christian religion to be taught at the expense of the State, for they realize that would mean many non-Christians are paying for it. On the other hand, they intimate that they will (1) keep careful watch to see that in English literature and in history the English Bible and the history of Christianity have a due place, and (2) send into the schools Christian teachers whose lives will preach the Christian Gospel". The Churches will

not do that, we fear. They will not even say, "On consideration of the teaching of an agreed religious syllabus, we will transfer all our schools to the local authorities". Instead Free Churchmen and others will probably receive the impression that the Church of England is seizing the opportunity—offered by the war situation and by the keen desire of the Free Churches for good relationships—to entrench some of its schools, and so perpetuate a dual system which holds up educational progress and is admittedly unjust. If so, conflict is inevitable. And the newly-discovered affection in Anglican circles for the Scottish system is certain to arouse suspicion. Fears have been expressed that the establishment of a uniform system will lead to totalitarianism. We do not share these misgivings: there is far too much variety in our education, and far too much local independence, for Whitehall to attempt Nazification! The crucial thing, if only the Churches would see it, is to get keen Christians into the schools; far better one such teaching mathematics than ten tepid or time-serving expounders of an agreed syllabus, even if the Apostles' Creed be included!

* * *

A REFERENCE in Dr. A. L. Drummond's article, "A Century of Chapel Architecture", in our October issue may have sent some of our readers in search not of a castle in the air, but a church or a cathedral. Muthesius having described many actual buildings Dr. Drummond had seen, Dr. Drummond assumed that the impressive Plate XXX of Union Church, Brighton, was of an actual building, which he describes on p. 324. This design, however, never materialized. The story seems to be this: During the Rev. R. J. Campbell's ministry a prize for a design was offered (probably by an individual connected with the church). Plans were submitted by Mr. J. W. Simpson, afterwards Sir John Simpson and a famous architect (Messrs. Simpson & Ayrton designed the Wembley Exhibition, 1924); they appeared in the *British Architect* (9th June, 1899) and the fine perspectives by Raffles Davidson were reproduced in the *Building News* (5th May and 23rd June, 1899). Shortly afterwards Mr. Campbell was called to the City Temple, and the project, which the office-bearers had already considered too costly, was abandoned. Thus Brighton's Congregational Cathedral never got beyond the tantalizing stage of a blue-print: we wish it were possible to reproduce the plates to show readers what might have been.

* * *

IT is a remarkable fact that while some schemes of Church Union have received a tremendous amount of attention, scarcely anything is heard of others, sometimes of even greater importance. The first type is the South India Scheme, which has received almost

the embarrassing publicity of a royal pregnancy. If after this too-long gestation the infant fails to survive, we imagine that blame will be placed on the Congregational element in the S.I.U.C.: Bishop Azariah, for whom we have the greatest admiration, and who is as selfless and devoted, but also as astute, as Mr. Gandhi himself, will see to that. The final edition of the Scheme will come before the negotiating Churches in the autumn. How far Anglo-Catholic opposition in this country will find expression in the Church of India's Diocesan Councils remains to be seen. The Methodist Provincial Synod has declared in favour. So have six of the eight Church Councils of the S.I.U.C., North Tamil having withdrawn its objections. The dissenting Councils are Travancore, which has reversed a previous vote and is now 37 per cent *For,* and 63 per cent *Against,* and Telugu, which has been consistently against, and now asks the S.I.U.C. to "explore the possibilities of a wider Federal Union upon a simpler and freer basis . . . until such time as a more united mind arises and an organic union commands the assent of a larger majority". The two dissenting Councils form 62 per cent of the total Christian community and 43 per cent of its communicant membership.

Whatever the decision, nobody will be able to complain that the Congregational Churches in Britain have exercised undue influence: it is seven years since the Joint Committee of the London Missionary Society and the Congregational Union of England and Wales met and answered queries from the S.I.U.C. The great blot on the Scheme still remains—the two statements, "It is the intention and expectation of the Church of South India that eventually every minister exercising a permanent ministry in it will be an episcopally ordained minister. . . . After this period of thirty years, the Church of South India will determine whether there shall continue to be any exceptions to the rule that its ministry is an episcopally ordained ministry". Why the Church of South India thirty years hence led by the Holy Spirit should not be allowed to decide without this present determination is not clear—or perhaps it is only too clear.

To turn now to a Scheme of Union to which we have seen no reference at all in the British religious press. Negotiations between the Evangelical and Reformed Church of the United States and the Congregational-Christian Churches are already well advanced. The spirit in which they are being conducted may be seen from the article by Dr. Douglas Horton, the Secretary of the Congregational-Christian Churches, reprinted from *Advance*. Already a joint committee has surveyed the situation and found a large measure of agreement on principles: the aim is

> to combine the types of government of the two denominations in such a way as to maintain all essential rights and responsi-

bilities held by churches and ministers under the separate organizations.

Following Canadian precedent, the suggested name is "The United Church of America", and the national body will be designated "Synod". The joint committee meets again during the spring.

* * *

WHAT excitement there would have been in the churches seventy years ago had an Archbishop of Canterbury and a Free Church dignitary issued a statement of the things most surely believed by Christians! Today it causes not the faintest ripple of interest: neither the journalist's gibe that the Archbishop would be well advised to stick to economics nor the Anglican theologian's onslaught on the statement has served to stimulate discussion. This, we believe, is not owing to any merits or demerits in the pronouncement itself, but merely to the fact that the present age, in spite of all that we hear, is not theologically minded. So much worse for the present age, it will be said. But is it not the fact that the Church and its members are judged not by their theology, but by their religion? The test the average man applies is our Lord's own test: "By their fruits ye shall know them". It is when the Church and its members can meet that test that the revival of religion will begin. We have lived through a generation when the lives of so-called Christian men and women have not been noticeably different from those of their fellows who made no Christian profession. The fruits of the Spirit have not been abundant, and so men have ceased to take notice of the Church. "They took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus": does it occur to anybody to say that about us modern Christians?

* * *

MR. HUGH SHEARMAN'S readable book, *The Bishop's Confession* (Faber, 8s. 6d.), is not without its significance here. It presumes to be the autobiography of a North of Ireland Bishop, a dreamy boy who drifted into the Church, lost his faith as a result of biblical criticism and the reading of materialistic science, preached the ethics of religion, fell suddenly in love in middle life, and finally became a bishop:

> I must have been as strange a choice of bishop as had been made there for a long time, a bishop without faith, hardly a Christian, sunk in a kind of torpor because of an unhappy, unilateral love affair with a film actress.

Something parallel to the bishop's religious pilgrimage has, we suspect, happened in many lives during the last generation. To how many, clergy and ministers and lay people, does the fact of the Incarnation, say, make a difference in daily life? If the life and teaching of Jesus were on record without the Christian affirm-

ations in regard to Him, would not the teaching of half the pulpits in the land be exactly what it is today? The relation of creed to life is a problem which demands renewed attention. Can it be claimed that preachers and people have any real belief in the great Christian doctrines?

* * *

At first we thought of applying to Miss Dallas Kenmare's *The Philosophy of Love* (Williams & Norgate, 7s. 6d.) words she applies to D. H. Lawrence's *Fantasia of the Unconscious*—"a work in which wisdom and absurdity is [*sic*] curiously mingled"—but that would be unfair, for there is much more wisdom than absurdity in her book. When she gets away from her authorities, and ceases to give "undeniable authenticity" to poems she likes, she has something very pertinent to say—and to the Church as well as to individuals. She knows all about the difference between *Agapē* and *Eros*, but is concerned to show that *Eros* is not a matter of sex only, but can be, in Petrarch's words, "The path that leads to heaven". So it was in the case of the Brownings, and so it should be wherever "the sexual life is united with the deeper life of love", for God has

> ordained for human beings the comfort and sweetness of human love and union, through which alone man could attain to his best development, and so discover at last the way to God. . . . The finest men and women are those who have resolved, so far as is humanly possible, the *Eros-Agapē* "problem".

The Church has been mistaken in emphasizing physical infidelity —"adultery is sin, while mental cruelty is unrecognized, violation of the soul condoned"—and in stressing a false asceticism. She has failed to give adequate teaching about marriage, and thought more about divorce: "if marriage were made as difficult as divorce, divorce would be far less frequent". Miss Kenmare thinks that only Christian marriages should be celebrated in churches, and she holds that the teaching of sex to children fails in that it begins with sex, which does not worry children, rather than with love, which every child instinctively understands.

From this summary it will be seen that this book deals in a constructive way with questions to which reference has recently been made in these pages. We commend it to the attention of our readers.

* * *

We have long been in the habit of recommending anyone attracted by the Roman Catholic Church, feeling that that Church produces saints and others who always live in peace and concord, to read Purcell's *Manning*. Now we have another book to recommend, the work of Manning's disciple and successor, Herbert Vaughan,

who, we note, began by saying "The effect [of Purcell's biography] on the whole is not bad", but ended by declaring the book to be "almost a crime". *Letters of Herbert Cardinal Vaughan to Lady Herbert of Lea* (Burns, Oates, 18s.) is edited, and shockingly edited, by Mr. Shane Leslie. There is no Index, no preliminary list of the families of the correspondents, and an amazing scarcity of notes; and when notes are given it is perhaps to the sixth reference to a person (*cf.* St. John Baptist de Rossi) and not to the first. We notice, too, the absence of any *Imprimatur*, and should not be surprised to hear that the volume gets somebody into trouble with the authorities of the Church. It would be hard to think of anything more indiscreet than the friendship of which this correspondence was the expression, and from no point of view does the Cardinal come out well. Lady Herbert was the widow of Florence Nightingale's friend, Sidney Herbert, who left her with seven children, all of whom, except one who married Baron von Hügel, remained Protestants, though their mother tried hard to win them for the Church she had joined. She was ten years older than Vaughan, who at 34 had already had an adventurous life when this correspondence began in 1867. Only his letters remain, and we do not wonder that he saw to it that hers were destroyed. For a man consecrated to the religious life to have a close friendship with an older woman is not unknown even in Nonconformist circles; but we doubt whether these letters can be paralleled in the case of a celibate who became in turn Bishop, Archbishop, and Cardinal. At first the letters were almost daily, and the recipient was in turn "My darling sister", "You clever little thing", "Dearest child", and "Coadjutrix", while she is often compared to his mother. Nevertheless, caution is frequently enjoined about meetings, and prudence regularly extolled. Only when Vaughan has become Bishop do the letters cease to be frequent and luscious, but even then and to the end he receives Lady Herbert's bounteous gifts; often saying that they prevent him keeping his vow of poverty, he nevertheless accepts them, even as he recommends her to make the acquaintance of other wealthy folk whose money the Church could use. Gifts of venison, 6 doz. claret, *etc.*, *etc.*, are balanced with constant benefactions to St. Joseph's College, Mill Hill, which Vaughan founded, and to the many other enterprises in which he was interested—and all from the lady who was constantly travelling about the world, and whom Mr. Leslie describes as giving from "the widow's mite"!

No, we cannot think the picture of Roman Catholicism seen in these pages will prove anything but repellent. There is all the jealousy and wirepulling which marks Manning's life; and Vaughan's ownership of *The Tablet* and the *Dublin Review* reveals that even dignitaries stoop to the tricks of journalism: Lady

Herbert is asked to write an anonymous letter in the Correspondence Columns! And there is a shattering proximity between Vaughan's statement about the missionary priests he was training, "I have had to *fight* for a field of martyrdom" with descriptions of fields possible as "very healthy" or the reverse.

* * *

MISPRINTS are the editor's bane, and they have a way of tripping the most watchful. An unhappy one appeared recently in a church magazine: the editor was speaking of the opportunities before the church, and the responsibility resting on the members in the call of the minister—which made them realize their impotence without God's help: "impotence" became "importance". Another one we just escaped in our review pages, where we had some difficulty in persuading the printer that Dr. Franks described Dr. Micklem's theological attitude as "irenic" and not "ironic". We hope there are no other misprints in this issue. Illness has played havoc with our proof-readers this quarter, and so we live in fear and trembling, and apologize in advance. We are grateful to all readers who responded to our appeal for copies of July, 1941.

* * *

HERE are stories of two preachers, in which the ingenuous Negro is to be preferred to the sophisticated Presbyterian. The first is taken from a delightful book which will give the reader many a pleasant hour—the Rev. J. G. Fyfe's *Scottish Diaries and Memories, 1746-1843* (Stirling: Mackay, 17s. 6d.—an amazingly cheap book; three of its 600 pages are worth the money, for they contain a list of Presbyterian and Independent Secessions in Scotland from 1679 on).

In 1767 there was a flood in Hawick, and James Laurie, the minister, was rallied for

> having delayed calling the people to prayers on the morning of the inundation, till he saw from his garden the flood a little abating; and then continuing so long in prayer (for a full hour) when it had fallen so much that a man on horseback could pass below the mill, which the good people ascribed to the fervency of their pastor, and would have continued to believe in the efficacy of his prayer, had not the surviving miller assured them that the inundation had fallen six inches before the bell rang.

The coloured preacher had the opposite problem, for in time of drought he had summoned his people to pray for rain. He thus addressed a crowded congregation:

> "Ah'm glad that so many folks a' heah to pray the Lord for rain. But ah has just one question to ahsk yo'. Where is yo' umbrellas?"

* * *

HERE is another extract from *Scottish Diaries,* though we make no charge for the prescription. The date is 1782, the writer John Mill, who ministered in the Shetlands for 63 years before his death in 1805 at the age of 92:

> There's a strange distemper called Influenza rages through Brittain, in the same manner as it did in the east countries of Russia, Denmark, etc., though as yet has not proved mortal. People are variously affected with it, with swelled faces, sore throats, breasts and stomachs, dizzy heads, coughs, violent pains and feverishness: for remedy is prescribed a decoction of 2 oz. lint-seed, 2 do. of Liquorish-stick bruised and boiled over a slow fire in a pint of water to half do. then strained and mixed with 4 oz. powdered suggar candy, also some lemon juice, brandy or rum; take frequently a spoonfull thereoff etc.

In the same volume is an account by Thomas Guthrie of a violent influenza epidemic in 1837.

* * *

OUR contributor, Sir Richard Acland, has made a magnificent gift to the nation, and it is only right that we should express our appreciation. It is not always that changed convictions lead to personal sacrifice, and so clear an example of conscientious renunciation cannot but do good. It is especially gratifying to find men in public life ready to show the reality of their beliefs by sacrifice; we believe that Mr. Tom Johnston, the Secretary of State for Scotland, declines to take the salary attached to his office on the ground that the ordinary Member of Parliament's remuneration should be sufficient.

* * *

TWO chuckles from Mr. T. Thompson's *Lancashire Rampant* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.), which contains 28 of the writer's delightful dialect sketches (but, why, oh why, the frontispiece, which is alien to the book and to the county?):

1. "A basin o' biled onions is good for a running cowd", said Mrs. Lomas. "He geet his cowd kewing for onions", said Mrs. Jackson. "An' just as he geet to th' door they wor all done".
2. "Docther once give me father a bottle a teaspoonful every two hours", said Joe. "Me father said he couldn't be bothered, so he supped all th' lot at one do. By Gow! Didn't his yure ston up!" "Did it cure him?" said Jimmy. "Well", said Joe, "it shifted his cough, but he walked wi' a limp for years after".

CAN WE PLAN AND BE FREE?

By the Rev. W. F. Lofthouse, D.D.

I. The present war is a gigantic struggle for freedom. All the nations engaged in it inscribe that sacred word on their banners. Even the Axis claim either that they are preserving their own countries from some hated tyrant, or, more boldly, that they are liberating other nations from the sway of pluto-democracy, or whatever name best fits the hatred of the moment. But we Anglo-Saxons have long regarded freedom as a special heritage of our own. It is our birthright; our native air. Tyranny cannot, shall not, live in a land where as soon as a slave touches its soil he is free. The great dates in our history point not to victories or royal accessions, but to the Bill of Rights, the Petition of Right, the Great Charter. Britons never shall be slaves. We defend "a fortress built by nature for herself, against infection and the hand of war". "We must be free or die, who speak the tongue that Shakespeare spoke". Once, no doubt, all this might have savoured of jingoism. A claim that is regarded as unchallenged borders on rhodomontade. But today all is different. Freedom has been deprived of one bliss after another. The issue faces us more clearly than it ever faced our fathers. Never has the danger been greater that freedom should perish from among men. Never has our own freedom seemed more precious to us, and a like freedom more needful for mankind.

Yet it is equally clear that our freedom is being thwarted in a hundred subtle ways, not from without but from within. We can neither buy nor sell nor produce as we choose; our time, our houses, are being commandeered; labour has surrendered its hard-bought liberties one after another; boards of control have interfered with our traditional rights in a fashion unknown even to the Star Chamber. We are regulated and regimented till we begin to ask, "Is not this Hitlerism in England?" And as if this were not enough, we are told in the most unmistakable language that we shall not be allowed to throw all this aside at the "cease fire", as, in 1918, along with our old uniforms, we flung D.O.R.A. out of doors. Our streets, our towns, are to be planned for us; our banks —who knows?—are to be nationalized; our industries to be parcelled out; our leisure to be organized and canalized; and our education to be modelled on a blueprint. No wonder that if such is the freedom we are fighting for, we rub our eyes and ask what freedom really is.

"In these days", some would say, "freedom must be a thing of compromise. We cannot be wholly free; at best, we can preserve part of our freedom by surrendering the rest. This we have had to do in war-time; and this we shall have to do in peace". We are back with old Hobbes of Malmesbury, who, in the days of the ding-dong struggle between King and Parliament, told us that only a totalitarian "Leviathan", as he called it, could keep our hands from each other's pockets and throats. We have not come to that yet; though who knows how vigorously temptation to lawlessness would prod us if the policeman were no more? But are we driven to the dusty refuge of compromise? Is compromise what Bishop Butler affirmed of probability, the guide of life? We refuse to allow this in religion and morals. But in politics? Only at our peril; for compromise will always be unstable; a matter of "pull devil, pull tailor", whether the pull is of physical force or economic advantage. And, worse still, it is the result of the muddled thinking of its advocates and its victims. There is no such thing as doing a little ill to do a great good. There is no "more or less" in good. Good, in conduct, is doing that which, as far as we can see, will, in the circumstances, render the truest service to that part of mankind which we can affect. We do not mix good and evil, whatever we may wrongly suppose. Are we prepared to mix freedom and slavery?

We are all aware of several different kinds of freedom, and the perils which beset them; social, intellectual, religious. There are indeed as many kinds of freedom as spheres in which men may act. President Roosevelt's four freedoms might have been quadrupled, even though he was, however excusably, guilty of using the word in different senses; freedom to perform an act, such as worship, is not the same thing as freedom from a yoke, such as want or hunger. Here, we are dealing mainly with political freedom. Can it be attained? Or, if attained, preserved? But, first, what is it in itself? How few of those, in whose ears it sounds like a trumpet, are agreed as to its meaning!

"Freedom", one will say, "is to do as we like". But that makes no sense; for we all choose what we like out of the generally very limited number of alternatives open to us; to choose apart from these alternatives is impossible. Freedom is thus either universal or non-existent, for individuals or for nations.

"Freedom consists in the absence of restrictions". Restrictions, alas, are never absent. But do we always deem them foes to freedom? The sprint runner will rejoice in the tapes between which he must hurl himself forward; and to the would-be virtuous citizen, as we have observed, the policeman is a godsend.

> Nuns fret not at their convent's narrow room.
> . . . In truth, the prison into which ourselves we doom
> No prison is.

What angers us is interference with what we want. One man is happy in a backyard; another fretful in a park. To be prevented in what we want to do is the constant lot of all; and most of us know pretty well how to deal with it. What really matters is interference with what we want to be or become. The lad who is bent on the career of a barrister or a sea-captain does not complain at the delays which occur in the course of his training; still less at the barriers to his liberty imposed by the discipline of his studies; nor does his brother who is destined for the Church. But if an accident condemn him to chronic invalidism, or a paternal decree or a State regulation close the door to his profession in his face, he would be more or less than human if he did not cry out "Slavery!"

II. Freedom is to be able to be what I want to be or what I want to become. It does not depend, therefore, merely on the things or the persons by whom I am surrounded. It also depends on me; on what I have been brought up to, and what I have schooled myself to make my goal. That is to say, it grows out of an agreement between myself and the authority or institution that shapes my environment. I am eager to be a doctor; authority prescribes so many years in the hospital; I admit its reasonableness; I am a free man. But if authority does not commend itself to me and my aims, whether others think either the rule or myself unreasonable or not, freedom is gone. In other words, I am conscious of freedom because I am conscious of being a member of a group, of identifying myself with its purpose, as it identifies itself with mine. Each of us acknowledges and approves certain rights and duties in relation to our neighbours. I am like the runner between the tapes. The society or the State marks out the course; I welcome the limits which concentrate my powers and protect their exercise from interference.

We thus move from the family or the profession to the nation. But the essence of freedom remains. It consists in an ideal, a conception of the good life, which is not held simply by me, but by the other members of my group, family, school, union. No one lives to himself. I am bound to adapt my conduct to the wishes and expectations of my neighbours. But if that is all, I merely make myself their slave. What is slavery but to live at the behest of another, as Vichy must live at the behest of Berlin? For freedom, the relation must be mutual. What others would have of me, I desire to give. What I require of them, I find and make my own. This is the reason why freedom can be enjoyed in States of such varying character; why, for instance, our ancestors could

huzza for freedom in an England which had never heard of industrial laws or reform bills; and why a German youth, as we are being constantly assured, can feel himself to be perfectly happy under a rule that seems to us to be the most horrible of all tyrannies. In each instance, the State gives what the individual is happy to accept, and prescribes what the individual is able and anxious to perform.

Yet if freedom were no more than this, we should have to admit that it had escaped us altogether. The German lad may be happy and enthusiastic. But does that make Germany a genuinely free country? We are happy under our own laws. Are we for that reason free ourselves? There always must be the subjective element in freedom. There is no freedom, indeed, unless a man can both feel his freedom and rejoice in it. And to place him in any society which will secure this for him is no mean achievement. But man is no mere bundle of feelings and joys. Not even the animals are this. Nor is society merely a contrivance for administering or withholding them. Man is made according to a plan. So is society. And the two plans interlock. What a man does, he must do with others; building the house, binding the sheaf, and even digging the grave. What he enjoys, he must enjoy with his neighbours. The wisdom of generations is caught in the children's rhyme of the boy who sat in a corner. And society is planned, unless it is to be a machine jolted and thrown out of gear, to encourage and develop this interlocking. Society can only be served worthily by individuals who are living their own lives. Individuals can only live their own lives as they unite with others for the common good of all—joy in widest commonalty spread. Each lives to preserve the freedom of all. "Free will", or rather, freedom, said George Macdonald, "is not the liberty to do whatever one likes, but the power of doing whatever one sees ought to be done". There is no freedom without this power. But the power itself, in spite of George Macdonald and Immanuel Kant, dwells only in a community, in which *we,* the members, perform *our* duties to each other and rejoice in the resulting fullness of life. Freedom means a free man in a free State. Destroy one and you destroy both. That is why Germany, with its "State is all, race is all, folk is all; Hans and Gretel are nothing", can never know freedom. And that is why a document like the recent Conservative Report on Education, with its insistence that it is the chief duty of the child to learn to serve the State, and of the State to see that he does so, needs the most careful watching[1].

[1] See *Looking Ahead*, Sept., 1942. "It has become a matter of life and death that the nation should command the service of all its citizens, high and low. . . . The State is not to be prevented from doing the things that it ought to do by the fear of antagonizing its local and other partners." The authors are not disposed to believe that a country has "everything to gain from the free growth of individuality among its potential citizens." Such phrases may be applied in very different directions; and are at best but half-truths.

There is indeed something noble in this devotion, this immolation of the individual to the State, even if it issues in such grotesque and ugly forms as the sterilization of the unhealthy or the euthanasia of the diseased, or even, some would add, of the consecration of the young girl, like the priestess of some obscene cult, to the animal rites of child-bearing. "Theirs not to reason why". We cannot withhold our praise from the obedience which knows not as yet what its Master is doing. It may be magnificent. But it is not freedom. It is suicide. For the State can only live in the persons who compose it. In their life consists its own. If the soldier is merely cannon fodder, when the fodder is used up the cannon will starve. If the children are merely the food, the sustenance of the State, when the children are gone, devoured by the State or by its foes, the State itself must perish. True, the brave man is always ready to lay down his life for his friends; "for the ashes of his fathers and the temples of his gods". But the only State that is worthy of such sacrifice, and that can survive it unharmed, is the State which has learnt to see in each of her sons an end in himself, a centre of noble activity and high purpose, trained and purified by all that she can do for him and enable him to do for himself; best of all, if that purpose is the full and joyous life of each one, when that which drew from out the deep of his own being turns again home.

III. Have we travelled away from freedom when we reach this point? On the contrary; complete freedom is to be found here, and only here. Men have wooed freedom as if they would induce her to live in a world of individuals. Liberty, said Mill, is each man's power to do as he likes, so long as he does not injure his fellows. Who knows when he does or does not injure his fellows? If that were freedom, complete freedom could only come about if there were but a single being left in the universe. Give him a companion, a helpmeet or a foe, and each conditions the other. Neither can do what he likes. Each is cramped and confined by the other. But that is not how we are made. Each of us grows up in a world where he is one of scores of millions. To achieve freedom, to lose the sense of limit, of frustration, is to learn not to clash but to harmonize with those who are round us, and from whom we cannot escape.

Hence, freedom must be something which is consistent with the laws and conditions of human life[2]. If we are to feel free from interference, we must choose the path where interference will not be encountered. To find that path, our heart instructs us. We

[2] "Politics", wrote Burke, "ought to be adapted, not to human reason, but to human nature, of which reason is but a part, and that by no means the greatest part."

follow it from childhood if we have grown up in any decent family. Not only do we learn to avoid quarrels, to keep our hands from picking and stealing; we learn to think, to plan, to study, to work, and to play together. What others desire of us, we, like St. Paul at Jerusalem, are eager to do. It is the lesson we are taught in every group, in all society. The real joy of life is not in the prize I can gain, whether I win it along with others or wrest it from them. It is the team-work itself (to use the common phrase) in which, subordinating ourselves to the rest, we do what we could not have done by ourselves, and enjoy what otherwise would have been beyond our reach.

When we apply this idea to the subject immediately before us, the question as it is generally asked ceases to have any meaning. How to combine freedom and regulation? There is no freedom save through regulation. The important point is to be sure that the regulation is of the right kind. And here the task is seen to be a double one. We have to ask whether the proposed plan, order, arrangement, will stimulate co-operation and neighbourliness, and the conviction that what we try to do can only be done if we work together, and that what we hope to enjoy can only be enjoyed with others. We have also to ask whether each proposed integration and mutual adjustment, on a nation-wide scale, will lead to an increasing value for genuine self-respect, and a growing delight in the happiness and well-being of society as a whole. If this could be gained, the several members of the body politic growing up, as it were, into one, what higher gift could freedom have to bestow? The ancient Athenian, it has been said, was content that his body should inhabit a hovel when his soul could dwell in the Acropolis. The Englishman, taught to regard his house as his castle, will often keep its gates bolted against all that in his heart he could desire.

IV. Let us see how this works out in the regions where planning is being most warmly discussed today; for instance, in the Youth Movement and the organization of Clubs. Consider these words of Mr. Basil Henriques, in the new edition of his *Club Leadership:*

> With regard to discipline, there need be no compulsion from an outside authority; for it has been found that under proper leadership and guidance, average boys will themselves submit to a self-imposed discipline, which they themselves as individuals approve and therefore accept, and which is accepted by the club as a whole. . . . The club must provide such an environment and such opportunities that the boy can find them sufficient counter-attractions to evil-doing, to lure him away from the desire to do evil.

Here in miniature is true freedom and genuine citizenship; and

here is the answer to the two questions we have just formulated. The same principle can be seen if we turn to the planning of towns and cities. The time is gone by when the individual builder, working for himself or employed by another, was left free to fling together rows of horrible boxes, cursed by the absence of light, decency, and cleanliness, corrupting their wretched and enslaved inhabitants in body and soul alike; or to erect suburban residences designed to enable each family to shut itself off in nervous isolation from its neighbours. Mr. Lewis Mumford, in his *Culture of Cities*, has been pressing on us the outlook of what he calls biotechnics in building, where each section, of house, office, public hall, church, or city, is meant to assist all the functions of human and social and civic life, and where village and town alike exhibit something of that delicate adaptation of part to part that is the glory and wonder of the human body. A house that would be too proud to fit in with its neighbourhood, and refused to adapt itself to the common water supply, the gas, sewage, electricity, and so forth, would be a prison-house for its tenant.

For more than thirty years, ever since the earliest Trade Boards Act, the State has been learning to provide the machinery by which employers and employees can freely work out their own regulations. Freely, because, bound by mutual agreement, and conscious of the approval and authority of the State to prevent interference, each can move to what he recognizes as his own best interest, the interest of the whole concern. Each, therefore, wisely instructed and encouraged, will do his best with the talents that he possesses. Freedom can never live with competition; with emulation it thrives.

The organized and planned interaction of State and private citizen can also be seen in the treatment of juvenile and to some extent of adult criminals. It is for the Court to announce the sentence, and the prison officials to carry it out. But a whole apparatus of private and personal care and assistance has grown up under the ægis of the State—probation officers, prisoners' friends, after-care committees, visiting magistrates, Borstal institutions, remand homes — where the restoration to self-respecting citizenship is the aim of the official and the unofficial alike. Together they are accomplishing more than John Howard or Elizabeth Fry ever hoped to see.

War-time itself will provide illustrations of the true nature of freedom. Why is it that the army has a fascination for the soldier? The secret may be partly learnt from some of Rupert Brooke's well-known verses. But men quite devoid of his sensitive idealism have felt the mysterious effects of comradeship, in which you need others as you know that they need you; and both needs are satis-

fied. A new freedom is discovered in the society in which competitors are replaced by allies. "Shall we stick together as long as we live?" More particularly, the peculiar and terrible exigencies of the present war have forced groups and even nations into the pooling of resources, the communication of intelligence, the rationing and sharing of stores and food, which, where it is honestly carried out, is fatal to the slavery of self-interest, and prepares—so at least one may dream—for a more genuine freedom, born of a more comprehensive integration, in the days that will follow the armistice and the peace.

Of the other freedom, the freedom now longed for by all the victims of the German gluttony for sovereignty and lust for oppression, there is no space to write. But the villainies which are crushing Holland, Serbia, Poland, and the rest, are only different from the tyrannies of the Turk, the Hun, the Mongol, and all the brutal conquerors of the past, because they are at once more savage, more cold-blooded, and more calculating. The passionate resolve of the nations that now sit in darkness to regain their freedom is not simply desire for release from hated interference by a foreign power; it is the determination to live their own lives and pursue their own ideals—heaven grant that as the clouds pass, they may be refined and purified—in their own way. Indeed, the slavery under which they groan is of itself begetting the idea of a freedom that is no longer negative—the expulsion of the armies of the tyrant, but positive—the common pursuit of the common good, as the miseries of the present and the vision of the future have combined to shape it in their hearts. The cry for freedom has been raised with no less persistence but with far less reason in India. Doubtless, Hindus and Moslems have both been persuaded to believe that they cannot fulfil their own destinies under the alien rule of the British *Raj;* but both have made it plain that what they fear is the domination of religion by religion and community by community, and that what they desire is to grasp in their own hands the power to oppress which terrifies them in the hands of others.

V. Such is what we may call the formula of freedom; the absence of interference with the way of life we desire, by whatever power, internal or foreign, it is threatened; and, in its true and indeed its only attainable form, of the way of life which has been ordained by the authority which has made us what we are, has laid it down for all time that men should live together as brothers, in families, in social groups, in nations, with one heart, one way, and one Lord and Master of us all. Few of us are wont to think of the *New Testament* as the text-book of freedom. The national and political enthusiasms of the *Old Testament* are wanting in the *New*. Under the sway of Rome they were unthinkable, save in

terms of a revolt more desperate than that of the Maccabees. But freedom is one of the key-words of the Christian message. To St. Paul, it is emancipation. To St. James, it is the gift of a higher or "royal" law. To St. John, it is the fruit of knowledge. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free". This is the very conclusion to which the argument of this paper has led. Truth, in the Fourth Gospel, denotes the essential nature of God and of man and of the relations that are meant to exist between them. We have found freedom in the knowledge of the conditions of human society and its dealings with the individuals who compose it; and if we are willing to admit that society has itself been planned by God, it is only a step further to find the heart of freedom in the conception of this society as held by the perfect and ideal man, the mouthpiece, as it were, of the Creator.

St. Paul, in his familiar antithesis between the slave and the free man, implies that both slavery and freedom are the lot of all of us; with two masters claiming us, we cannot but obey the one and defy the other. But slavery to sin and to Christ are two different things. One imprisons us within the world of wages (we must forgive the mixture of metaphors); the other lifts us into the world of grace. The individual who grows up into Christ finds his way into the exalted society where at last he can be what he was meant to be by God. To obey the conditions of life in such a society, the "royal law", can be nothing but "perfect freedom". Interference there is inconceivable.

Freedom, like every human good, is bestowed by God, yet achieved by man. This surely is true of every kind of freedom, economic, social, political, or religious. It is offered to us, but at the price of discipline, humility, patience, imagination, faith. From of old, freedom sits on the heights. "Liberty", in the words of Professor Coulton, "will not descend to a people; people must raise themselves to liberty; it is a blessing that must be earned before it can be enjoyed". But he that hath, to him shall be given. As Lord Hugh Cecil said in 1909:

> As man marches forward to his appointed goal, he becomes more and more fit to enjoy the liberty which is one of the attributes of divinity.

We cannot tell what new channels for freedom we may dig in the coming days; what enlargements of our existing reservoirs we shall undertake; what new springs we shall discover. But the river of the water of life, dammed in vain through the past by ignorance and cupidity, will yet, if our faith and courage do not fail, be led to flow through the streets of the city of God, where the very leaves of the trees on its banks are for the healing of the nations.

THE GOSPEL AND COMMUNITY CHANGE

By the Rev. Harold Thomas, M.A.

The day on which Jesus met Zacchæus at the sycamore tree by the Jericho Road was not only momentous for the soul of that little man, but was memorable in the life of the district in which he farmed the Roman taxes. He made in the company of Jesus the most amazing discovery he, or any of us, can ever make in life—that sinners though he or we may be, God deals with us as "Sons of Abraham", as the children of His love. But Zacchæus went away empowered by that discovery to right the wrongs he had done in his dealings with his fellows. The community was the better because of the change in his own heart.

Now Zacchæus is a type which appeals to us in the West, for ever since the Reformation the individual has been regarded as the supreme object of the grace of God in Christ. He is counted as the unit of society, and social changes have been expected to be consequences of a man's experience of God's love showing itself in the love of the man's neighbour as himself. "A Redeemed Society through Redeemed Men" is the modern phrase expressing this.

But neither the richness of personal experience, nor the pervasive individualism of our inherited civilization, should cause us to limit the salvation which Christ offers to us, or to ignore *the many passages in the Gospels in which community change is expected which does not conform to what we have called the Zacchæus type.*

John the Baptist's national mission of repentance and hope was the immediate precursor of our Lord's ministry. The Gospels give us glimpses of His public ministry in the populous cities and country towns of Galilee, among people ripe for revolution to throw off the Roman yoke. We are shown the amazing popularity of Jesus, culminating in the attempt to make Him King, an offer which He refused. Then follow days of concentrated teaching of the Twelve leading to the climax in the confession of Peter at Cæsarea Philippi, "Thou art the Christ". We often take this to be an acknowledgment by our Lord of failure in His appeal to the community and consequent acceptance of the better way of redeeming the individual. But is this correct? No sooner had Peter declared Him Messiah than Jesus set Himself to go to Jerusalem, to the citadel and centre of the Jewish nation. His teaching of the people (as contrasted with teachings of His disciples) in the last period is full of warning of the impending catastrophe awaiting the nation—"except they repent". "Why could they not judge for

themselves what was right as they could read the signs of the weather in the sky?'' Or like the victims slaughtered by Pilate, or killed by the falling tower of Siloam, all would perish. The entry into Jerusalem was that of the Messiah coming to His people: ''Behold Thy King cometh unto thee, meek and riding upon an ass, even upon a colt the foal of an ass''. He was the Son coming to His Father's vineyard, and His rejection meant its removal from the wicked husbandmen and their destruction — and the rulers knew the parable applied to them. All the blood shed by the nation's blind rejection of God's messengers (from Abel to Zacharias the son of Barachias, from *Gen.* to *2 Chr., i.e.,* from the first book to the last of the Hebrew Bible) was to be required of that generation. It broke His heart that they knew not the things that belonged unto peace!—for all the warm patriotism of the Psalms, ''If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning'', is echoed in His cry, ''O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children together . . . and ye would not''.

Jesus does not deny His Messiahship before Caiaphas, and in *Jn.* His conversation with Pilate is a discussion of the only possible principle of true government in God's world—''Thou couldest not have any authority . . . except it were given thee from above''. The crisis of His nation was in His mind on the *Via Dolorosa,* ''Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for Me . . . for if they do these things in a green tree, what shall they do in a dry?'' And if from the Cross His Word to the dying rebel, ''Today thou shalt be with Me in Paradise'', covers all we need to know of God's love for each one of us which death does not defeat, so His prayer, ''Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do'', shows Him holding His people and the Roman world in an unbreakable reconciling love to God. No wonder that One who achieves so great a redeeming act came back saying, ''All power and authority in heaven and on earth is given unto Me''. Judah and Rome and all nations are even now beloved of God, and are held in the arms of so great a Lover, Who awaits our turning to Him in repentance that we may live.

Now Jesus had not been to every man and woman in Chorazin and Bethsaida and Capernaum during two years of His public ministry offering His salvation to every individual, and yet He announced the doom of these cities ''because they repented not''. Nor had He done this in His many visits to Jerusalem, which the words ''How often would I have gathered thee'' imply, though He adds ''and ye would not''. *He treats civic and national communities as entities,* having a life of their own, and capable of responding to Him and to His words, or of rejecting them. *Community*

change is offered immediately and directly by the fact of our Lord's presence in the life of a town or nation.

If we ask what is the content of the new life which they were called to enter by repentance and which His presence would give them the power to live, the answer is to be found in the ethical teaching of Jesus. From this we may single out "the care of the poor" as of supreme significance. In the sermon at Nazareth (*Lk.* 4^{16-30}) He sets out His policy in the words, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me because He hath anointed Me to preach good tidings to the poor". The remainder of the quotation explicates its contents—care of the broken-hearted, the captives, the blind, the oppressed—as the punctuation (traceable in the Hebrew, Greek, and in the Targum on *Is.* 61) shows. No community can claim His spirit or righteousness which neglects the poor. But this is a foreign policy as well as domestic, for as illustrations of "the poor" He gave the Widow of Sarepta (from hated Jezebel's country) and Naaman (the Syrian raider), arch-types of hereditary enemy countries of His people. A repentant community would so act to other communities as to enrich *their* poor with its own riches. What a word to the Jews this was, who at that time had the carrying trade of the East in their hands, and who were the bankers of the Ancient World. This policy is the economic content of the exhortation, "Love your enemies", which He so steadily reiterated. And we are justified in taking this principle as cardinal to His purpose, for it follows through to the end of His teaching. In the great assize, *Mt.* 25, it is all the nations who are gathered for judgment and are divided on the right and on the left, for extermination or for lasting on into the great Kingdom, according to their treatment of the poor, the hungry, thirsty, ill-clad, homeless, sick, and imprisoned. The nations which repent and accept His policy shall abide in His Kingdom even as Sodom by repentance would have lasted on "until His day" (*Mt.* 11^{23}). This is the true condition of survival in God's world. And in this same Gospel our Lord's last command to His followers is "Go ye and discipline *the nations*"—not simply by snatching souls as brands from the burning. And He still makes the same demand, for "Lo, He is with us always even unto the consummation of the age".

Both Zacchæus and Jericho were offered salvation when Jesus walked through the city streets. If a penitent Zacchæus brought some Christian grace into the life of the unresponsive city, so an unrepentant Zacchæus would have been constrained as an individual to accept Jesus if the city of Jericho had repented and had taken Him as the Lord of its life.

Two other New Testament writings besides the Gospels envisage community salvation and both add something to our understand-

ing of it. In *Ro.* 9-11 Paul deals with the defection of Israel from her calling as God's chosen people and his hopes of her ultimate salvation. Israel, cut off as a fruitless olive branch to be grafted in again to the true stock, is regarded as a spiritual unity. Paul's use of the term "Israel" is a reminder that this term in the *O.T.* generally describes the nation in personal terms. In *Gen.* "Israel" is both patriarch and clan; in the Suffering Servant passages (*Is.* 42, 49, 50, and 53) the community is described in such personal terms as to be prophetic anticipations of our Lord's Messiahship; and in the Gospels and in Paul's chapters here individuality and community are not considered as incompatible or mutually exclusive—they are unconsciously assumed to be perfectible together by the one and self-same saving grace of Christ. Neither the corporate clan state of the time of Achan, when all his clan and possessions were stoned for his individual sin, nor the individualism of Ezekiel's "the soul that sinneth it shall die", is the true Biblical doctrine, but the blending of the two in the Gospel of the Kingdom of God.

Paul's use of the term Israel in the "new Israel" reminds us that the Church, the community of the redeemed, is the body of Christ. Already by Paul's time that Church had grown by community movements into it—3,000 on the day of Pentecost, the household of Cornelius of Cæsarea, of the Philippian gaoler—as well as by individual conversion, such as the lame man at the gate of the temple, or Apollos. The Church presents the world with the example of the redeemed community life it would have all communities know and enjoy. The Church is seen to be essential to the Gospel. You or I as individuals may preach what Christ can do for any soul which will come to Him, but only the spokesman of a community, redeemed in its common life by Christ, can preach Christ the community Saviour. Without the Church there can be no full proclamation of the Gospel of Christ.

The other *N.T.* writer is the Apocalyptist who gives us the vision of the City of God coming down from heaven, and the kings of the earth (national communities) bringing their glory and honour into it. But the picture includes our economic life, for the street of the city—the bazaar and market place—is of pure gold: poverty is ended and through the gates of the City all peoples come freely to share its wealth and healing. The Light of God and of the Lamb shines through the gold "clear as crystal", or, in John Macmurray's phrase, "Christianity has become the spirit of the secular society". But unlike Macmurray's picture the Church has not disappeared, though there be no temple or exclusive priesthood therein, for all "His servants do Him service" ("the workers, δοῦλοι, are His worshippers"). The whole community-life is unified

and changed by the indwelling Grace of the Lamb of God. It is the Father's purpose to give the world that community life.

The modern missionary movement has the merit of supplying us in the West with empiric evidence of Christian community change. The Mass Movements of India are more accurately described as community movements. A whole homogeneous community comes to a decision to take the "Jesus way", often without any single member having found Christ previously. The witness of the changed community-life of a neighbouring Christian village leads the village to seek instruction and baptism. "If you would know what Christian baptism means", says one of our missionaries, "you should see a village baptism, when all the adults of the community go down into the water together and come out literally radiant and transformed". Christians from the West tended to look askance at this way into the Church and Kingdom until Bishop Pickett's books, *Christian Mass Movements in India* and *Christ's Way to India's Heart,* solidly vindicated it as a way of evangelism. The Madras Conference showed that this method was not exclusively Indian. The Batak Church in Sumatra is a conspicuous example of the method, which can be matched in Papua, China, and Africa. Similarly, Dr. K. S. Latourette[1] has shown us that historically the Church has grown by mass conversions from the day of Pentecost to the end of the 16th century, during which period whole populations were baptized with their kings on accepting Christianity. Community conversion has been the normal way by which peoples have entered the Kingdom of God in Christ. The exception is in our individualistic Western civilization or where this is spreading now over the world, rapidly destroying the community life of simpler people, often so tragically.

It is providential that just when the need of the world for community redemption is deepest the purpose of Christ for community change is being revealed to us in the Gospels. Deep ever calls to deep, and the calamitous need for world community is matched by God's gift of the World Church at the point in history when above all it is needed. For we are convinced that there are ahead of us glorious experiences of national community change which Christ has in store for the world, of which the local community changes we have mentioned are but hints or pointers. We should be eager to win these new triumphs for the Gospel of Christ.

We may further illustrate the thesis by considering the effect its acceptance will have, (a) on our work of personal evangelism, (b) on our hopes for the nations, and (c) on the life and work of the Churches.

[1] *E.g.,* Madras Report, III. 1-11.

(a) We recognize that individual conversion leads to community change, and since this is the commonly accepted type in this country it is right that the utmost use should be made of it. Its weakness lies in the slowness with which social results follow individual change. John Wesley had been dead 42 years before the slave trade was abolished in the British Empire in 1833, which is rightly regarded as a fruit of the Evangelical Revival. We cannot afford such a time lag in these critical years of poverty and warfare. Can we speed up the change?

I make two suggestions. First, we may increase the emphasis we lay in our Churches on the social virtues in Christian character. Let us remember that when we are converted we are lifted to the ethical standard of the community in which our conversion takes place. We become total abstainers, or temperate, according as we are converted by the Salvation Army or High Anglican Clergy: pacifist or non-pacifist as Quaker or Church Army is the means of our conversion. We are not thinking now of any social application or implication of our Christian understanding of life, but of the immediate ethical transformation of the soul by its surrender to Christ which we call conversion. Now let the Church accept as its standard of Christian ethic that a Christian is one who loves the community more than himself, and who is eager and ready for any personal change which will be involved in changing society in order that the poor may be saved, and this community-redeeming life will be immediately realized in the act of conversion.

It is Christian tactics to attack the enemy at his strongest, and we may illustrate here the change in outlook involved by a quotation from A. E. Zimmern's *Spiritual Values and World Affairs,* in which he gives

> a conversation between Baron von Hügel and the exponent of a scheme for the Christianizing of a factory of which he was the proprietor. The man enlarged upon the ventilation, central heating, the welfare system, the part-time education, the dental clinic, the dining-room, the swimming-pool, the playing fields—and all the time the old Baron was getting more and more impatient. Finally, he broke in fiercely, "You haven't begun to understand what Christianity is: Christianity is not refreshment bars and swimming-pools—it is a soul in the presence of God".

Zimmern adds—"the conversation ended abruptly". But why? Why did not the business man answer valiantly, "In Whose presence do I build my gymnasium, plan my model factory, care for my work people? Nay—do I not carry on my business itself in the presence of God? For if the Master said, 'Inasmuch as ye clothe or feed one of the least of these, ye do it unto Me'—can we

not claim His presence as we make cloth or food by which thousands will be clothed or fed?"

We fear the silenced layman, and the Baron and many of us, have been individual pietists at heart. We are to repent and to be converted into true-community members with a sense of all industry and business as being part of the Heavenly Father's business.

The second suggestion is that we should discriminate carefully between individual and community sin. We shall help the sensitive conscience of our best young people who discover on beginning work that the community life is largely unchristian and are apt to throw up Christianity rather than be hypocrites. The circle of home and friends has been largely christianized, with love and goodwill as its guiding spirit. Now the young person has no hatred toward the 99 other applicants for the post which he succeeds in obtaining and yet he knows he has pushed them back at least into disappointment, if not into frustration and want. The sin is that of the community, and while as members of the community we must bear it, it is not our own as individuals. Similarly, we shall do less to alienate our Christian business men by our witness against community sin if we clearly draw the distinction between individual and community responsibility for the evils that exist. Only a community change can end community sin. Not even the whole Church in England, but England only, can end England's unemployment or other national wrongs. And Christ offers England, through national repentance and faith, the power to do these things.

(b) We should rejoice in the possibility of community conversion by the power of the Gospel because this only is adequate to meet the needs of the nations in the present hour. How are we to change the spirit of the German people, and especially of its youth, trained to despise what we humbly adore in Christ? How win Russia to true Communism for all its people, to the practice of conversion instead of elimination in dealing with its opponents, and to a synthesis of its aim of economic democracy with religion? How win our monied, propertied classes to be ready to share their possessions and privileges in the great adventure of building up a true Christian commonwealth of all the people, and how sweeten the bitterness of the dispossessed to conquer their oppressors by forgiveness? *Christ the Community Saviour waits to do these things.*

Our purpose is simply to establish the fact of Christ's offer of community salvation. Once that is accepted, the Church will speedily discover ways of community evangelism. But we may note that the more completely national unity is achieved the more directly can the appeal of the Gospel be addressed to it.

We may recall how for the first time in history one voice can be heard by a whole nation or Empire, or half the world; how private interests are being subordinated to public demands—and we can see how much greater than ever before are the possibilities of united national action in the Christian way if a Christian Church will call us to it. Days of National Prayer point to still greater possibilities of a religious nature. And memories of the psychological sensitiveness of us all on Nov. 11th, 1918, suggest that there may be an Armistice Day ahead of us when in glad relief and thankfulness a people may be ready to hear the prophetic call of the Master to His way of the Kingdom. For our Lord surely stands today over London, Paris, Berlin, Moscow, and New York, saying "How often would I have gathered you!" Our one hope is that He may not have to add, "Behold, your house is left unto you desolate".

(c) If the future is to see the glory and honour of Britain, France, Germany, Russia, and America and of the nations of the Orient and South brought into the City of God, a World Church must lead them there. The responsibility of the *World Church* is obvious. We must try to bring home to each smallest church the fact that it is part of the whole world company of Christ, that all nations may see before their eyes in the unity of the World Church that Christ is the Saviour they need. The responsibilities of the *National Churches* are equally obvious.

We, as *Congregationalists,* have our own special responsibility and danger. We are not individualist Christians by our very calling. Congregationalism does not know the solitary Christian. Do you remember the answer of Henry Barrow to the saintly Bishop Andrewes who commended prison as a solitary state much to be desired by a Christian for meditation, "You speak philosophically, but not Christianly. So sweet is the harmony of God's graces unto me in the congregation, and the conversation of the saints at all times, as I think myself as a sparrow on the housetop when I am exiled from them"? We ought to be able to say to small communities around us — scientific and art societies, recreation clubs, co-operative, trade, or industrial groups, and all engaged in things that are of good report — "there is prosperity and joy and happiness awaiting you if you will accept Jesus Christ as the Head of your fellowship, and go about your work knowing that in it you are about your Heavenly Father's business". We who stress the corporate experience of God's grace have special responsibility to pass on the Gospel of community change. And we should use our freedom to unite with all our fellow Christians to call us nationally and locally to accept Jesus and His Way.

But our peculiar danger is that of separatism from the life of

the wider community. We have been "saved to save". This is especially true about the financial support of our churches. If some munificent benefactor could endow us so as to make us independent of the ups and downs of the economic life of our nation, we ought to pray for grace to refuse his offer. Our churches certainly need financial support, but we should obtain this only by seeking to build up the wealth of the whole population of Britain, thereby finding the solution of our financial troubles by helping to solve those of the community. The "Gospel to the poor" is our contribution to such a community change. Do you remember Karl Barth's declaration that the Church would win her freedom to preach only if she won true freedom for all people?—freedom of thought, of speech, of the press, and of all writing. The Master's words are true for the life of the Church as well as for the individual. The Church that would save its life shall lose it, but that Church will save itself that is prepared to lose itself in the cause of ending poverty and bringing in the Christian order of life in the community. In witnessing for the ending of poverty in all lands is the Church's true method of saving her own financial life, for only in the redeemed economic life of the world should the Church desire to be saved financially.

But the motive must ever be "for Christ's sake and the Gospel's". For our whole trust is in the power of Christ to change the community life as radically and as powerfully as He changes the individual who comes to Him.

He breaks the power of cancelled sin;
He sets the prisoner free;
His blood can make the foulest clean;
His blood availed for me.

To the natural man this is inconceivable—to us who are being saved it is the power of God, and its proclamation is the "Glorious Gospel of the Blessed God" to the individual. Our Gospel to the community is a parallel call to an Act of Faith which will enable any nation or city to accept Jesus as its Lord, to acknowledge the fact of the Love of God for it even while yet sinful, and to rise in the power of that discovery to build its life in the ways of the Kingdom—especially that prosperity may come to its own poor, and to the poor of all other nations with which it has to deal. For that end we must witness to Him and pray. The historic consequences of such a conversion would be apocalyptic in their swiftness, but not unexpectedly so, for in days such as these our Lord bids us lift up our heads for our redemption draweth nigh.

ARNOLD THOMAS

By the Rev. Frank H. Ballard, M.A.

Ministers in charge of congregations are frequently more conscious of the failings than of the virtues of their predecessors. There are some in every congregation who remain loyal and grateful to the man who has gone. There are, indeed, often some who sing his praises so loudly that the newcomer is in danger of developing an inferiority complex. But there are others—and if they are not actually in a majority they tend to be more vocal—who in confidential tones inform the incoming pastor of the many things his predecessor could not do and the many other things he did wrong. There was one of my predecessors who by general consent stood so far above the rest of us that not only the members of his own congregation but the men who were called to succeed him were prepared to confess that they were not worthy so much as to stoop down and unloose the latchet of his shoes. Arnold Thomas of Bristol was a man so much greater in mind and so much more lofty in spirit that it was a never-ending wonder to me—and possibly a still greater marvel to others!—that I should have been called to stand in his place and try to continue his work. Not that there was ever anything dazzling about his eloquence or anything in his ministry that greatly impressed the vulgar mind. He eschewed brilliance and a display of learning as a well-bred woman would refuse to cover her fingers with rings. But one could not be long in his presence without feeling the persuasiveness not only of a cultured mind but of a devout spirit. Arnold Thomas lived nearer than most men, and nearer than most ministers, to the heart of religion. He was an example to us all, not so much as a preacher or a pastor or a scholar, but primarily as a man who walked with God.

The wisdom of including him in the present series[1] might be questioned from two different quarters. On the one hand are writers like Sheila Kaye-Smith who proudly contrast the "saints" of Catholicism with the "worthies" of other religious "bodies". The saints of Catholicism have been canonized by the Church and set apart officially from the common crowd. The "worthies" of Protestantism—amongst whom she would place all our leaders in prayer and service—may have many virtues, but by the very nature of things they cannot belong to this spiritual aristocracy. Unfortunately for those who adopt this attitude, the "worthies"

[1] This was the last in a course of lectures on "Seekers after God" delivered to missionaries at a Conference held at Homerton College, Cambridge.

are frequently more attractive, and their lives bear scrutiny by Christian standards more successfully, than many of those who can boast all that ecclesiastical canonization can give. Not for a moment do we question the excellence of some of the Catholic saints. But there are others who do little credit to their Church and from whose published works one turns with a feeling of despair. Cyril of Alexandria was a canonized saint, but a careful Cambridge scholar has declared[2] that he was

> a master of intrigue, of fraud and bribery, of violence and cruelty, without honesty, without honour, a man driven to the basest courses by pride and ambition, a disciple of Lucifer rather than of Jesus.

Vladimir was a canonized saint, all sins being forgiven to the man who made Kiev a Christian city and the Russians obedient to Christian rites, but, as Fisher reminds us in his *History of Europe,* he was a fratricide, maintained 3,500 concubines, and carried through the business of conversion with the high hand of a pirate. Comparisons may be odious, but to mention "saints" like these in the same breath as "worthies" like F. D. Maurice or Frank Crossley or Arnold Thomas is to turn canonization into magic and to insult not only our intelligence but still more our instinct for goodness and for truth. Men like George Fox and John Woolman and women like Josephine Butler and Mary Slessor have never had their praises sung in St. Peter's, but they have been chosen by the general verdict of their respective Communions and by the grateful recognition of the Church Universal as saints in the truest sense of the word.

There is also Arnold Thomas himself, who would beg us to desist and to realize what a poor human mortal he was. He would protest that in no sense could he claim, or could others claim on his behalf, any kind of eminence. He never wrote a book that will live through the ages. He never did a thing that would place him amongst the famous. He was simply a Congregational minister who, without any conspicuous success in brief London pastorates, was called to succeed his father in Bristol and there remained until his work was done. And all this is true. A quieter, a more uneventful life could hardly be imagined. But the Church in its instinct for unofficial canonization thinks more of what a man *is* than what he does, and no matter how much Arnold Thomas might protest, those who knew him best continued to affirm that far more than most of us he was a good man, a devout man, a Christian man.

Not that he was perfect. He was exceedingly shy and with some people so reserved that he seemed distant and almost unin-

[2] C. E. Raven, *A Wanderer's Way,* 68-9.

terested. And this characteristic of his became one of the characteristics of the congregation to which he ministered for so many years. People who did not understand them thought of them as consciously superior. How well I remember one man who came to reside in the neighbourhood saying to his wife when she suggested that they should attend Highbury: "Oh, Highbury is not meant for folk like us". Actually he did attend, and he and his wife are faithful members to this day. But his first reaction was that they were not quite class enough to be happy in such a church. Actually the aloofness which was undoubtedly there sprang not from social pride but from shyness. It had its good qualities as well as its doubtful ones. It included such a respect for the privacy of the individual soul that there was no danger of prying into one another's secrets. "Sharing", as some people have understood it, would be indecent to Arnold Thomas and those who gathered around him. He would as little have dreamt of undue curiosity about other people's spiritual condition as he would have dreamt of intruding behind altar rails and using priestly utensils in a secular way. On the other hand there was sometimes diffidence where there might well have been frankness. I remember one young man summoning up courage to call at Arnold Thomas's house to consult him about Church membership and finding the minister so loth to ask leading questions that he had to volunteer the information himself. Arnold Thomas was not unconscious of this weakness in himself and his people, for in 1891 he wrote these words in his yearly pastoral letter:

> Is it not possible that we are putting ourselves a little too much under restraint, and that there is amongst us a certain lack of openness and freedom in speech and fellowship, which is to be regretted? Are we not afraid of each other? . . . How seldom we have anything to say about the things that concern us most deeply, and how seldom we venture to say it! I cannot help thinking that we are losing much in this way, and that great happiness and power might come to us as a Church if only the ice could be fairly broken, and the deep waters begin to flow. . . . A few simple and broken utterances have sometimes had a strange power to make soft the hearts, and bring tears to the eyes, of those that have listened.

I have sometimes wondered also whether he would not have been a greater man if he had suffered more. The same question has been raised about Tennyson. Tennyson, it has been said, knew bereavement and sorrow as most men know them, and the marks of them are in his poetry, especially in *In Memoriam*. But how much deeper and how much more universal his work might have been had he known pain not as other people know it but much

in excess of other people. Mencius, the third century Chinese philosopher, is reported to have said that

> when Heaven is about to confer a great office on any man, it first exercises his mind with suffering, and his sinews and bones with toil. . . . Life springs from sorrow.

So far as I am able to tell, Arnold Thomas had no such apprenticeship. He was born into a comfortable home, went smoothly through Mill Hill School and Cambridge University, settled down as minister to a prosperous congregation, was blessed with seclusion and happiness in his home-life, and was spared the blasts of adversity and the blows of tragedy. I wonder whether his career was not too smooth and successful and whether he would not have been a greater man and have spoken more authoritatively to the common heart of humanity if his eyes had been more often blinded by tears. One can only raise the question; one cannot be dogmatic; for no one really knows what pain is to others. We vary so much in physical and mental sensitiveness that what is torture to one is but a pin-prick to another. And one must not forget that Arnold Thomas was one of the most sensitive of men, with an artistic nature easily wounded by coarse and cruel things. Even an apparently successful pastorate amongst fairly prosperous people may have been a keener discipline to him than a succession of calamities to men of tougher fibre. These words, written in the early days of ministerial life, warn us that a pastorate was not to him a bed of roses:

> I wish I could say that I was getting on well, but alas! I get sometimes into a condition of absolute despair. Sermon-writing is torture and the anticipation of public work usually misery, but I suppose all men, all young men at least, feel the same, and it does not do to complain.

And then, after some general reflections upon the testing work of the ministry, come these words:

> Perhaps I suffer more than others because of my nervous and irritable temperament, but I cannot pretend to find pleasure in my work, or to be fond of my profession.

Dr. Micklem, in his understanding memoir published in 1925, quotes this outburst and adds that later in life Arnold Thomas did find infinite satisfaction and joy in his work, but that he never appeared upon any platform or pulpit except under a sense of duty and took no pleasure in the sound of his own voice or in the applause which often greeted him.

But I am inclined to say that Arnold Thomas's chief imperfection was a diffidence which developed in his final years into a settled disinclination to come to decisions. Dr. Micklem likens him both in his shrinking and in his courage to the prophet Jeremiah.

I have often thought of him as a modern Amiel. There is the same philosophical cast of mind, the same dislike of superficial dogmatism, the same ripe culture, and the same difficulty in coming to conclusions. It was seen by the friends of his early days, who have told us how he had "to wrestle for foothold every step of the way he had to tread"[3]. Nothing was taken for granted. Nothing was affirmed as true until he saw it for himself. This was, indeed, a great asset. Men who listened to him knew that he thought before he spoke, that he looked all round a subject before he published a verdict. But sometimes in old age he debated within himself too long, even on matters of small importance. Business matters would be discussed in deacons' meetings, and instead of action being taken decision would be deferred until the next monthly meeting. No doubt many rash mistakes were thus avoided, but also opportunities were missed and impatience sometimes created in younger minds. It is not given to many, even of the greatest of men, to arrive at a perfect balance here, and I suppose that generally we are tempted to be too precipitate in youth and too cautious in later years. There is enough of the youth still in me to cause me to applaud an aphorism of Bishop Gore, who in his book on *Ephesians* says that "if rashness has slain its thousands, irresolution has slain its tens of thousands".

Let it not be imagined from these candid confessions that in the Highbury pulpit the trumpet sounded an uncertain note. There was always a sense of the mystery of life and the reminder that what is known is small compared with what is unknown. But against that background there was set in clear relief the things that may most surely be believed. Before writing this appreciation I spent considerable time refreshing my memory of him by reading some of his published addresses, and I have been struck at least as much by his sure affirmations as by his reverent agnosticism. Again and again I have been reminded of the characteristic expression of Paul the Apostle: "I am *persuaded*". A multitude of things might remain uncertain, but out of the prevailing mystery there arose a core of certainty. He was persuaded that Christ is the way, the truth, and the life, that if we are to come to a knowledge of God it must be through Him. He was persuaded that there is no way of life to be compared with the Christian way. He was full of charity to those who belonged to other households of faith, but he was a convinced Protestant, and while not making excessive claims for Congregationalism believed that the Communion into which he had been born had guarded important truths and made a distinct contribution to the Universal Church. He was very sure that no class, no nation, no congregation could live to itself, and out of that sprang his life-long missionary zeal. Highbury was ever

[3] Professor Armitage.

generous in its support of the foreign work of the Church, especially through the London Missionary Society, and sent some of her most devoted sons and daughters out to the field. In all this the congregation was but following the lead of its minister. But it was not unmindful of local needs. I sometimes wonder if any congregation in the country has done more for its own city, and especially for the poorer parts of its own city, than Highbury has done for Bristol. And most of it had been started and maintained so unostentatiously that few people outside the city knew that anything exceptional was being done. It was for the Broad Plain Mission that the hymn was written which is now well known throughout British Congregationalism and will one day, one hopes, be included in most hymnbooks:

> Brother, who on Thy heart didst bear
> The burden of our shame and sin,
> And stoopest ever still to share
> The fight without, the fear within. . . .

Work like this was not maintained for half a century without beliefs, beliefs that had been tested by the intellect and proved in experience. I remember the last time he stood in the Highbury pulpit as its senior minister. The personal note was not obtruded, but naturally there were some backward glances. Most of the sermon has faded from my memory, but I remember how he pulled his majestic figure to its full height and, turning to the younger people, assured them that he knew this gospel he had tried to preach was true because he had proved it and not found it wanting.

> He fought his doubts and gather'd strength,
> He would not make his judgment blind,
> He faced the spectres of the mind
> And laid them: thus he came at length
> . . . . . .
> To find a stronger faith his own;
> And Power was with him in the night,
> Which makes the darkness and the light,
> And dwells not in the light alone.

I do not know exactly how far addresses delivered from the Chair of the Congregational Union of England and Wales may be regarded as a true index to the characters of the men who are called to that high office. I am inclined to believe that there are very few surprises. That is to say the man who is primarily interested in theology gives us theology, the man who is interested in denominational machinery sticks to his last, and the man who is pugnacious and controversial by nature makes many ears to tingle. One could not have expected any of these things from Arnold Thomas. Everyone expected what they received—in the spring an address "On

Being Good", in the autumn an address "On Being Religious". We shall discover the essentials of his gospel if we review these two addresses—which should be read again and again, especially by ministers who are in danger of losing their own souls while ministering to others.

The address "On Being Good" begins with Sir Walter Scott's dying words to his biographer. "Lockhart", he said,

> I may have but a few minutes to speak to you. My dear, be a good man; be virtuous; be religious; be a good man; nothing else will give you any comfort when you come to lie here.

That, said Arnold Thomas, is what churches are for. They are not idols to be worshipped, or venerable relics to be preserved, or ornaments to be admired. They are instruments for purifying and perfecting human souls. And that is what doctrines and sacraments are for. They are not riddles for metaphysicians or material for theological lectures and debates. Their essential purpose is a practical one. Now here the complacent denominationalist may stand and say that he is not as other men. "We have had our infirmities, no doubt, but if anything is to be said in our favour, it must be this, that we have cared more for justice, honour, purity, truth, than for any kind of outward show, or worldly glory, or personal comfort". But while it is true that we have protested against the more gross and palpable vices, have we cared as we ought about the less obvious application of great moral principles? We have had much to say about education, and especially about freedom from sectarian tests in education, but have we as parents done our whole duty in the education of our own children? We know that the rich should help the poor, but have we taken pains to discover the difference between thoughtless philanthropy and genuine Christian help? We know the good man is not cruel, but have we done anything to win the gratitude and affection of dumb creatures? Goodness is more than justice, as justice is commonly understood. It is not enough to be truthful and honest and chaste and to pay one's way. "There is the goodness which we call by the beautiful name of grace". It is not enough to be respected as a pillar of society. One must desire to be a gentleman, a person of charm. Ministers especially need to remember that to do good they must be good. And that is the problem of problems. Any fool, it has been said, can be clever. But to be good—that is another matter. It is, no doubt, a perilous thing to think too much about the subject. It is always perilous for man to make himself the centre of his thoughts. But if we think of ourselves, not as belonging to ourselves, or as existing for ourselves, but as belonging to God and existing for His purposes, the danger is not likely to be serious. And if goodness is impossible to us, all things are possible to God,

> And by His almighty help it lies within our reach to be honest, pure of heart, loving, gentle, magnanimous, brave, in all things like our Lord, which is the best that any child of man can ever hope for or desire.

The address may be said to bear the mark not only of the good man who delivered it but also of the age in which it was delivered. There are some amongst us who would certainly maintain that it was deficient in theology and that something more definite ought to have been said about the grim and persistent fact of human sin. I can imagine some of our younger men especially, when they have finished reading Arnold Thomas, getting down Dr. J. S. Whale's *Christian Doctrine* and turning to the chapter on "Man and his Sin" and pausing over sentences like these:

> Long before the advent of modern psycho-analysis, Christian doctrine had unmasked much that passes for righteousness and high moral principle. It had insisted that there is no sin as subtle as the sin of "goodness", as popularly or legalistically conceived. All our righteousness is tainted. High-sounding moral principles often include a rationalization of our self-interest. . . . Even at its best, man's goodness is poisoned.

This is only a sample of teaching that has now become popular: there is much more even in the book from which I have just quoted. The emphasis and the language are certainly different, and between the two there is room for much debate. I do not, however, feel that between Thomas and Whale there is any radical antinomy. The older man was probably more of a humanist and the younger one more of a theologian; the one would possibly feel more at home with Erasmus and the other with Luther or Calvin. But they would sing with perfect unanimity the children's hymn which so aptly sums up the whole mission and work of Jesus Christ:

> He died that we might be forgiven,
> He died to make us *good*.

The other address, "On Being Religious", was delivered in October, 1899, and is as fitting today as it was then. It is rather pessimistic in tone, though we are apt to speak as though all leaders of religion then were steeped in optimism. It affirmed that interest in religion is not the same thing as being religious. One can read, and even write, books on religious subjects without being really devout. One can attend many services and still remain secular in spirit:

> St. Paul was struck by the extent to which the people of Athens seemed to be interested in religion. And yet their religion was not exactly what he meant by religion.

Perhaps he would feel the same about modern developments in ritual and symbolism, about the building of new cathedrals and the

perfecting of ecclesiastical machinery. All these things can actually become substitutes for God. One may even be an eloquent preacher or a successful missionary and still not be in any deep sense of the word a religious person. To be religious you must worship the Father in spirit and in truth:

> To be religious is to be in direct and personal relation with God. It is to be reconciled to Him, to be at least willing and anxious to be reconciled to Him. It is to be living as in His presence and as His child.

Now in those days nearly everybody believed in progress, almost in automatic progress. But was there progress in the knowledge of God? Arnold Thomas thought there was not. He quoted Dr. Dale as saying,

> God Himself is passing out of our life. In every direction I see the signs that we are living without God—in the Church as well as in the world.

And men were content that it should be so. What did it matter, they said, so long as men remained moral? And some who gave up religion did seem to be as upright and as honourable as those who were considered devout, and indeed in some cases they seemed to be the leaders in integrity and fidelity to duty. Arnold Thomas dealt with that oft-recurring problem of the non-religious moral person and suggested that they were really more religious than they knew — that faith and reverence and consecration may remain when God seems to be lost. May not a man who believes with all his heart in goodness and truth and love be said in a sense to be worshipping God? But, apart from that particular problem, how deplorable if men are content to remain ignorant about God! Is not such knowledge, even as knowledge, very much worth possessing? "You wear yourself out in the study of the anatomy of an insect", he said to an imaginary sceptic,

> and I do not blame you. I honour you. But with your consuming zeal for knowing, will you not admit that there may be some interest in knowing something about the Eternal, if by care and toil and meditation and prayer anything can be learned about His nature and His ways?

A secular soul means a dwarfed soul. There is something terribly lacking in his life:

> Think of that Kingdom of God of which Christ spoke, and the glory and worth of which to Him were so immeasurable. Think of those who rule in it, of those majestic Powers and Presences who make it what it is. Think of the great company of those who are its citizens. Think of its pursuits, its interests, its opportunities, its privileges, its rewards. And think of the lot of that man to whom all the grace and wonder of that Kingdom is as a sealed book, whose feet have never trodden the

soil of that sweet country, who has never breathed its pure invigorating air, whose eyes have never seen the Kingdom of God, who is of the earth, earthy. Think of that man, and be sorry for him.

There is, of course, nothing new in all this. It has been the task of the saints in every generation to remind us that theological learning, ecclesiastical zeal, even exemplary missionary service—excellent as they are—do not guarantee a religious spirit. It was a part of the mission of our Lord to make men see that these things can be positively dangerous unless there is at the same time deep reverence. "O come, let us worship and bow down; let us kneel before the Lord our Maker". That is the authentic note. And what Arnold Thomas said about being religious is important not because it had never been said before, but because he was an illustration of his own words. People did not go to Highbury expecting brilliant dialectical discourses. They went because they knew that they would be helped to worship God. I have heard better preaching elsewhere. I have never known anyone who led men so naturally into the Holy Presence. There was very rarely any assistance from the well-known prayers of the Church, though I think there was no prejudice against liturgies. There was never any sense of laborious preparation and certainly no anxiety to impress. There was rare beauty of diction, but it seemed to be entirely unstudied and unpremeditated. The prevailing impression was of sincerity and simplicity, and as one listened one realized the tremendous possibilities of this type of worship. It was a religious soul expressing itself in public and leading other religious souls to the throne of grace. It was a high-priestly act in the best sense of the word, and the grateful remembrance of it is more than anything else justification for this personal appreciation.

There I must end. I wanted especially to speak about his humour, his love of Nature, his deep regard for his native city, his splendid face and figure. But I shall not have failed altogether if I can give some idea of him so quietly and so persuasively leading the quite unpretentious but always dignified worship of his people. To his successor it was a benediction, but it was also his despair. How could one hope to continue such a ministry? Fortunately I never tried to imitate him: that would have been grotesque. I knew that I must be myself and lay whatever slender gifts I might possess upon the same altar. But those months that we were working together gave me a new vision of what the Christian ministry might be and what worship in a Congregational Church might be. And, more, I came to understand what it means to be a good and a religious man. It was a true word we carved immediately behind the pulpit under the figure of the Good Shepherd with his sheep: "Great grace was upon him".

WHAT IS A LAYMAN?

By the Rev. JOHN DAVIES.

MY dictionary defines a layman as "one of the people, as distinguished from a clergyman (no mention of minister) or, by analogy, from a member of any other of the learned professions: non-expert in some profession or science".

This definition or description, though not exhaustive, is quite helpful, and does give us, so to speak, a starting-point.

We recall remarks that even experts in some branches of knowledge or science have made when speaking ("daring to speak", as they said) about sciences, about branches of knowledge, which were outside their special and peculiar province. They said: "Of course, I am speaking now as a layman in these things". They had in mind, perhaps, astronomy, medicine, soldiering, philosophy, theology, literature, Hebrew, Greek, or even geography. They meant that they had only a little knowledge, a general knowledge, of these subjects. Many of them were experts in some thing, but they confessed that they were not experts in all things; they knew nearly everything about something, and something, perhaps, of everything. So they said: "We are laymen in many things on which from time to time we dare speak and pass an opinion". We knew quite well what they meant when they described themselves as laymen; they meant that they were non-expert in the topic under discussion. But even these would not claim infallibility (only people with a little knowledge do that—the untaught who cannot be taught) when making pronouncements upon the subject on which they are experts, but we should certainly claim for them that they can speak with authority. A man, after all, can be an authority without being infallible, and need not say half-apologetically: "I am a layman in this thing". When I am ill I go (in spite of the Christian Scientists) to my doctor, and I go with the assurance that he is an authority, even though not infallible, and that he is able to diagnose my trouble, and, after diagnosis, to prescribe the remedy.

In the same way I go to the astronomer when I am eager to know something about the stars, and to the scholar when I want to know the correct rendering of a text, or the right way of interpreting the Bible. I would not claim infallibility for these people, but I would claim that they are experts or authorities on their special subjects.

I accept, therefore, the very convenient definition which my

dictionary gives me: one who may be an expert in one branch of learning, but a non-expert in some others.

It is, however, when we come to religion and theology that we begin furiously to think and ask questions. Is a layman (and here I mean a Christian layman), a man who is not ordained, a man who has not been, say, to a theological college, a non-expert in *religion?* Surely not. Every true Christian, surely, knows God by experience; every Christian can say: I know whom I have believed; I know that I am in the Kingdom and that the Kingdom (the realm of God) is in me. If not, then there is the challenge to every layman to enter the Kingdom, to know God in Christ for himself, in his own life, in his own experience.

There are laymen who are laymen, very much so, in theology, which is the science of religion, and in philosophy, who are poor scholars, but who are not, most certainly not, laymen in religion.

Religion, an experience of God in the soul, the knowledge of Christ as a personal Saviour, is common to all true Christians whether they are not, or are, theologians and scholars.

I think I know what is meant when it is said that "It is the heart that makes the theologian", and I will admit that it is true, as long as we do not read too much into the saying; as long, *e.g.*, as we do not say that an experience of God will turn a man in an instant (without further study and thought) into a profound theologian and scholar, and so able to give a reason, in words, for the faith that is in him, as a learned theologian is expected to do and can do when the need arises.

A layman (since we must use the word) is not a layman in religion, and, what is more to the point, should not be, for he can, for himself, know God in his own soul, know Him as a Spirit that has met his spirit, know Him as a power not himself, that makes for real goodness and graciousness of character. That, I think, is the challenge to us all, whether we be laymen or ministers—to seek for God till we find Him for ourselves, and so be able to say: God *has* extended His healing reign over *our* spirits, and we know it as certainly as we know that we are alive.

Should a layman preach; should he preach in the church and to the Church? I need not remind you that some laymen do, and that they do it with dignity and power and general acceptance. But should all preach in the church and to the Church? It depends on many things. It depends upon whether a man (the man, of course, who knows religion at first hand) has the voice, the gift, the mouth, the language, *etc., etc.* Were some laymen asked to preach they would say: "Who are we, that we should do this? We are not eloquent; but we are slow of speech, and of a slow tongue". After all, we are to rise and bring our *peculiar* gifts to

God and the Church, and God never asks a man to do what he cannot do. But there is no doubt that many laymen should preach, preach in the church, and so to the Church. Many who do preach should *not* be doing so, and that many who do not, who refuse, should be doing so. It is strange but true that many who think they can, cannot, and that many who think they cannot could if they had, shall we say, less modesty. But whether we preach or whether we don't, in the accepted meaning of the term, it is, I think, essential that "the redeemed of the Lord" should "say so". The redeemed of the Lord will find a way of saying to others what God can do, and will say it with conviction and power because He has done it in them and for them. They will find a way of saying, will make the opportunity for saying, that they know One Who has made all things new for them, and that they are new creations in Him.

This is the challenge to us all—to say so, to say so to all, to those nearest to us first of all, and then extend the circle till all with whom we are in touch shall have no excuse for saying that they have not heard of Christ and the power of His resurrection.

None of us should be laymen in these vital matters. If we are, we should examine ourselves, we should ask questions, we should ponder whether our hearts are burning within us because Christ has addressed us, whether we have maintained the spiritual glow, or whether we have lost the blessedness we knew when first we saw our Lord. After all, were not the prophets laymen, and, in all reverence I say it, was not Jesus Himself a layman?.

So it is time we asked the question, time to put it to ourselves, minister and people alike: are we non-experts in religion, in that which saves us, in that which bears the spirit up, in that power not ourselves that makes for great Christian thinking and living? Are we truly redeemed, and do we say so? If we are redeemed we shall say: "Wist ye not that we must say so?" That word "*must*" reminds me of the famous definition of a genius: "A genius does what he *must*". Is it too much to say that we are all geniuses, in that sense, when we are really and truly redeemed; we simply *must, must* say so, we *must* tell, we *must* proclaim, *must* cry: "O magnify the Lord with me; and let us exalt His name together; I was dead, and now I am alive again; I was cold and indifferent, but now I am enthusiastic, God is in me and I am in God; I was bored and saw no meaning in life, but now I am thrilled, for I have found a purpose, a purpose that burns within my heart; and it is to introduce men to Jesus Christ".

MY FRIENDS THE SAHIBS

By "Timothy".

When I came to live here, eighteen months ago, someone said, "This town has more retired generals, per acre, than any other in Britain". I almost think it is true. Our staple industry is caring for retired officers, mostly from the Indian Army. For instance, at the last Home Guard lecture I attended, sixteen of us were present. We included one retired general, one retired captain, R.N., six retired colonels, one retired major; yet, in the Home Guard, only two or three of them were officers, and then only junior ones.

At first, it rather frightened me. Had I been coming to the Vicarage and the Parish Church, it might have been different, but I came to a Manse and a Nonconformist Church, and, thinking I knew something of the religion of the retired Indian Army man, I reckoned I should find myself in somewhat chilly waters. I expected to find my new neighbours dull, gouty or apoplectic, snobbish, intolerant, and very Tory.

I have found how wrong I was. I am not sure when it started. It may have been when Toc H asked me to become their Padre, or when the Vicar (also ex-India) put his library at my disposal, or when the Church schoolmaster told me to make myself at home in his school. My education was carried a step further when we had a United Week of Prayer. I preached at Parish Church Evensong, and the Vicar went to the Baptist Church, while the Salvation Army Captain preached in the other Anglican Church, but that was the smaller part of it; the real point was the way in which the Sahibs, C. of E. almost to a man, came to the other places of worship.

Since then I have found how broad-minded they can be about religion. It is common to find a Sahib or two in my congregation, though they feel it would be treason to support me regularly. They are friendly, but quite unable to appreciate our position, and wonder why we "have to be different". Very few of them can realize we feel principles are at stake; but then, for one big section of them, religious tradition counts for more than doctrine. The other section, rather strangely, reckon the personality of the parson of most account; one said to me, typically, "I don't care a damn what the religion is as long as we have some good fellows to run it"! And yet their religion is not as shallow as that might sound; many of them, like so many soldiers, have a good working knowledge of the Bible, and a strong Fundamentalist leaning, with a special love for prophecy.

Politically they are puzzled. There are, of course, those to whom "the British Empire" is synonymous with "the Kingdom of God", but they have given their lives in the Empire's service and it is little wonder if they nearly worship that for which they have worked so well. The political opinions of many more are in a state of flux. If a man who has given thirty years to India has managed to keep his eyes open, he must be asking awkward questions; and many of the Sahibs are. On the whole, their outlook is forward; their interest is in the future much more than in the past, especially about India and the Empire. They dread lest the edifice they have helped to build should be spoiled or undermined. Because of that fear they favour inaction or extremely slow and careful movement in Imperial matters.

But they are, in many cases, far from the dyed-in-the-wool Toryism which I had expected. "Puzzled" is the right word; a Major-General said the other day, "I don't know where I am, politically, Padre; if there was a Christian Socialist party I'd join it; I'm certainly not a Tory". Almost without exception, they are not fond of the National Government. It is common knowledge that many Sahibs looked with favour on the British Union of Fascists before the war, and I am sure that is because they admire strength and discipline, both individual and communal, and they felt the British Union might rescue England from what they considered a sloppy way of life. They were bound to be disappointed, for they are kindly folks and have no love for the rubber truncheon as an instrument of discipline, and no faith in it as a sign of strength. Now they are feeling that weakness must be the prime condition of coalition, and while they cannot gainsay that "Unity is strength", they would prefer a strong party government. Meanwhile the Canterbury-Cripps alliance intrigues them. They are not sure about it, yet, but if the Archbishop can proceed without offending their sense of the constitutional, and if Sir Stafford does not frighten them, I believe the alliance will gain their support. It has the dignity of the Established Church and the moral discipline of a Crusade. Besides, "Cripps comes of a good family"!

That love of discipline is a factor to reckon with if you want to stand well with the Sahibs. I am trying to get used to it in all sorts of little ways. If I write anything more important than an invitation to tea (and now I am the town's Scoutmaster I often do) I always head it "Your ref. .....", "My ref. .....", and underline the subject of the communication. It pays, and back come the replies, starting with, "Ref. your Memo. No. .....", and with numbered paragraphs. They like it that way.

That same spirit makes them work. They have service in their bones, and A.R.P. and other war-time jobs are their very life.

Their sense of public duty is something terrific; I only hope they manage to pass it on the post-war generation. Not, by the way, that they are good at A.R.P., *etc*. They are old and fussy, they get jealous of each other, they are reluctant to "begin at page one", and their recollections of how things were done in the last (or the Boer) war are a constant nuisance. But they certainly work; Charity Garden Parties, Services Church-parades, Civil Defence, or Golf Club Committees, they do more than their bit. Now, of course, their bit includes running their own homes, which they feel is rather much to ask. One of the Memsahibs said, "In India I never had fewer than two dozen house-servants"; now she has an old cook-housekeeper and a very young maid who will soon be leaving her, and still she is better off than many of her neighbours. So the Sahibs and their wives roll up their sleeves and get to know their own kitchens; they have "weeding-teas" and dig the lawns they cared for so well, and talk proudly of their beetroot. They are really beginning to feel the war, now. Most of them have lost a younger member of the family, and their stock of food and clothes are running out. I heard of one who, last year, made "only ten pounds of jam, as against forty each year so far". These domestic troubles hit them harder than most other things; but their sense of duty carries them through, though not without complaining.

Socially it is great fun. They know I am not, as they might put it, "out of the top drawer", and that usually counts. But I am a "Padre", and I am interested in local activities, and "any how, dash it, it is up to us all to pull together", so most of them "know" me. I visit a good many of them, and they talk to me (in their annoyingly loud tones) in the street or our local coffee *rendez-vous*. They recall Viceregal functions, and chatter the items I read in the next day's Court Circular, and I tell them about life in Battersea, and always ask their opinion of the news. They accept me, as I am sure they accept anyone who is sensible enough to be honest and sincere and public-minded and, above all, reasonably within the conventions.

My wife, alas, cannot get on with the Memsahibs. My three-guinea suit looks just that, but it is not a barrier (it is smarter than many a Sahib's twelve-guinea one; I suppose that is the reaction from wearing uniform), but my wife says her home-made frocks and ready-made suit make her shy and clumsy. She says the Memsahibs give her one look which says they know just how little she pays for her clothes, and that, starting from there, they make certain social calculations which put us outside the limit. I think my wife exaggerates their feelings, or perhaps she is embarrassed because we cannot entertain as the Memsahibs do. I must say

they are not as ready as their men are to accept a stranger without reference to social credentials and antecedents. They are very queenly, even when washing the dishes.

I call them "My *Friends* the Sahibs". I like to think that is not much of an over-statement. Remembering that most of them have sons of more than my age, and in view of all the differences of background and circumstances, we get on awfully well, and the credit goes to them. I like them; I declare the "ex-Indian Army" a good type, approachable, responsible, though not without their weaknesses. I admire the Sahibs, and thank them for a valuable contribution to our land, our empire, and our world.

That a missionary of the London Missionary Society should be teaching Chinese in Oxford is a sign of the apostolic succession, and two books recently issued prove that the Rev. E. R. Hughes is doing for our generation what James Legge did for the Victorians. Mr. Hughes is to be warmly congratulated both on his "Everyman" volume *Chinese Philosophy in Classical Times* (Dent, 3s.) and on his edition of *The Great Learning and The Mean-in-Action* (Dent, 8s. 6d.). Quite unable to judge Mr. Hughes's translations, we have the greatest admiration for his commentary: his learning never stifles his humanity, and there is a charm about his exposition of these two famous Chinese classics which carries one over even the sections on textual criticism. Without straining Mr. Hughes shows that these writings have a message for our times: the picture of Chiang Kai-shek consciously or unconsciously falling back on *The Great Learning* in his country's hour of trial is but the outstanding example, though it deserves to be quoted in full:

> In the war now raging Chinese power to resist was, on the surface, irretrievably weakened, first by the loss of Shanghai and Nanking, and then by the loss of Hankow. A few days before Hankow fell Marshal Chiang called a mass meeting of the civil officials. He opened the proceedings by drawing attention to the fact that it was a cold day, and since the soldiers at the front were mostly without overcoats, it would be appropriate if those assembled removed theirs. They did. The nation's leader then said that he had called them together to face certain facts in the situation. The first was that those who wanted peace in the world had to see to it that their country was well governed. Those who wanted that had to see to it that harmony reigned in the family group. Those who aimed at that had to see to it that they made men of themselves. Having enunciated this primary fact the leader went on to deal with the evacuation of the capital and a continuance of the resistance. His statement of principle was taken word for word from the opening sentences of *The Great Learning;* and, when he and his armies retired further west, the officials he had exhorted, along with some tens of millions of the people, went with him. To live under Japanese rule was not compatible with making a man of oneself.

An admirable addendum to these books is the Rev. H. B. Rattenbury's *Understanding China* (Muller, 4s. & 2s. 6d.), a vivid description by one who has lived in the country for over thirty years.

EDITOR.

TWO NOTABLE SCOTTISH CENTENARIES

By Dr. JOHN MURPHY.

THERE are two circumstances, both concerned with Holy Scripture, and occurring some hundreds of years before, which were most influential in creating these two centenaries—of the founding of the Evangelical Union, and of the Disruption of the Free Church from the Established Church of Scotland. One is the study of the Bible in the quiet and safety of the monasteries, amid the disorder in Europe after the break-up of the Roman Empire, with its effect upon the minds of certain scholars and teachers of the Medieval Church; and the other is the translation of the Bible into the vernacular speech of the leading European nations, so that it could be read by considerable numbers of quite humble people, the common men and women in the different countries. A largely novel and intensely important power was thus brought to bear upon the minds and characters both of learned and simple who were within or in touch with the Christian Church. That power may be seen operating in two ways, on the one hand upon the scholars, and, on the other, upon the common people who were able to hear the Scriptures in their own tongue, or to read them for themselves. Hence ensued a striking double revelation in the unveiling of the personality of Jesus Himself in the New Testament in His human reality as He had not been seen since the days of His actual life on earth; and with this was given the almost equally thrilling series of pictures and scenes from the Gospels showing from His words and His dealing with men and women His own high valuation of the individual soul, and His singular devotion to the task of awakening in the common multitudes of His day a realization of the value of each of them to the love of God. These two revelations, which restore the situation in the Gospels of a direct personal presence of the Master to His disciples and scholars who are to be His apostles and evangelists, and of the rediscovery of the worth of every soul to the love of God, are the fountainheads of all true streams of evangelism whatsoever. They are discernible clearly in that claim of James Morison to declare salvation as the free offer of God to every soul, which led to his expulsion from the Secession Church; and they can be seen more obscurely but none the less really in the departure of Thomas Chalmers and three hundred ministers from the Church of Scotland on the ground of the right of every member in a Christian church to choose along with the other members of that community their spiritual leadership.

The roots of these modern movements in the recovery of the Christ of the Gospels, of the warm human reality of Jesus as a person who could be loved and served, in place of the more distant figure of the creeds, are worth illustrating because a line can be traced through them to a similar inspiration in the direct personal relation to Christ of those who gave a new impulse in different ages to the expansion of Christianity, and the revival of the true life of the Church. There is no space to follow the line in detail, but it would pass through Bernard of Clairvaux, Francis of Assisi, *Piers Plowman,* and others on its way to Scotland in 1843.

The relation of the Bible to religion is of immense importance for the understanding of the religious life of Scotland. Its times of refreshment, its burgeoning spring seasons, its harvests of souls ripened in faith, its occasions of glad and noble sacrifice for truth and right—all which might be summed up in the phrase "Revivals of Religion"—issue in one form or other from a newly-discovered or freshly-emphasized truth of Scripture. On the other hand, its divisions among the churches, its exclusions, heresy-hunts, and the formation of sects, have also had a more or less direct reference to the authority of Scripture. We shall consider presently the relation of Scripture as thus authoritative to the emergence of the two Churches, the Evangelical Union and the Free Church, a hundred years ago, for that was a great factor in their origin. In the meantime we shall note the importance of the widespread knowledge of the Scriptures which existed in Scotland after the Reformation and the translation of them into English.

Erasmus, as is well-known, prepared an edition of the Greek New Testament with a Latin translation which was immensely valuable as the basis of the later translations into the vernaculars. We may quote the famous passage in the Introduction in which he dissents from those who would lock up the Scriptures from translation into the common tongues:

> I long that the husbandman should sing portions of them to himself as he follows the plough, that the weaver should hum them to the tune of his shuttle, that the traveller should beguile with these stories the tedium of his journey.

This dream of Erasmus was to a considerable extent realized in Scotland, where the Bible had a wide circulation after it was translated into English among the common people. This was fostered by the habit of family worship of which Burns has given the classic picture in "The Cottar's Saturday Night". Such worship was recommended by the Church as a natural duty and privilege; in some parishes Bibles were provided for those who could not afford to buy them. In the home of the cottar, the farmer, the handloom-weaver, the "big ha' Bible" brought, along with an amazingly rich literature, the judgments and the inspirations of religion into

everyday life. The use of the Scriptures was made more feasible and general by the improvement in education through the system of schools which was, as Regent Moray said, "a devout imagination" of John Knox, but which was partially brought down to earth by him, and was extended in parish schools established by the State Church. Hence arose throughout the towns, villages, and farms of the country a considerable body of men sufficiently educated to read the Bible and conduct worship. These men and women in their homes were interested in religious questions, and often took a pleasure in conversation about them; among such people there was a capacity for judgment when differences upon doctrine occurred, and at the same time they were ready to be kindled when the flame of evangelical revival came near.

Amid much else which was cold and unresponsive, such as the Moderatism which prevailed in the Church of Scotland at the time, there were two 18th century Revival movements which took advantage of this favourable spiritual condition. One was the extension of the famous activities of Wesley and Whitefield into Scotland; the other was the evangelistic mission of the brothers James and Robert Haldane, from which sprang the Congregational Churches in Scotland. For different reasons these must be mentioned as stages on the way to the two events which we have chiefly in mind. The two great Methodists raised no questions of doctrine or creed or Church and State, but first Whitefield, a strong Calvinist, and then Wesley, an Arminian in theology, represented religion,

> not as an exercise in dialectics, but as a union of the soul with God, who held up Christ to the people as the giver of eternal life, the redeemer of the will from the guilt and the power of sin[1].

It is probably not too high an estimate of the same writer that

> the lasting value of the service that Whitefield and Wesley rendered to Scotland lay in this — that they entirely transformed the religious *feeling* of the country, they kindled a hot, glowing passion for souls which has never died out[2].

The Revival movement of Robert and James Haldane about half a century later than the great Methodist Revival was inspired by the same Gospel of the individual value of the human soul to God, and of the right of every one to have this good news preached to them. Something of this fundamental truth of the Gospel doubtless came to them through the Methodist work itself; and the example of apostleship in reaching the neglected masses of the people by itinerant preaching, learned from Jesus Himself and His disciples, may have been suggestive to them. It is striking that Robert Haldane declared that he was "aroused from the sleep of

[1] W. G. Berry, *Scotland's Struggles for Religious Liberty*, 85. [2] *Op. cit.*, 87.

spiritual death by the excitement of the French Revolution, obtained the consolations of the Gospel", and felt impelled to seek the extension of Christ's kingdom. Significantly, this was near that "dawn" of the revolutionary awakening in which for Wordsworth it was "bliss to be alive" and before the Terror with its savagery and the subsequent shaking of vested interests in wealth, comfort, and power, had driven the leaders of men in this country and in the Church back upon formulæ, with an apparent basis in religion, which answered better to their timidity than to a living faith. Those ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity which the French borrowed from the Puritans and the American Constitution, and thus, at third hand, from the New Testament, may have had much to do with the sacrificial act of the two brothers in devoting their wealth to the financing of their missions, and selling their estate in Stirlingshire to provide churches for the "gathered people". Sacrificial action of this real sort became more difficult and rare as the nineteenth century advanced, and the dogma prevailed that the main responsibility of wealth was to preserve and increase it in the interests of society itself and even of the poor. This sacrificial element is present in the revivals of the Nazareth Gospel to "the poor" from St. Francis onward to the Haldanes and James Morison of the Evangelical Union Church and Thomas Chalmers of the Disruption.

The first impulse of Robert Haldane's conversion was towards preaching to the heathen in Bengal in India; but permission to do this was refused, as in the case of William Carey, by the East India Company. This turned his energies to the conversion of the heathen at home. The work had much success in Edinburgh, and a particular impression was made in the East and North of Scotland. Churches which afterwards became Congregational or Independent by name were the "gathered people" of any neighbourhood who were brought together by the acceptance of the Gospel of the love of God in Christ. The success of the "missioners" was due partly to the tradition of family religion we have mentioned, and the intelligent interest in religious questions fostered by it in the cottages, farms, villages, and smaller towns; and the result was that some of the churches so formed, for example in the North-east of Scotland, were remarkably productive in able and scholarly men in the ministry, as well as leaders and teachers in medicine and the other sciences. Organization and a certain degree of corporate unity among the churches was a natural result of the spread of the movement; in this journal it is unnecessary to describe these. But it may be noted that the institutions gradually formed worked most sweetly when they were created by the life of the Church as an organism of which the life was the presence of Christ in the midst, and the creative impulse was the

love of men through Him. Dr. Lindsay Alexander gives an example of the evil tendency of the working of a different principle which some had sought to introduce, namely,

> that Christians are bound to conform their ecclesiastical usages in the minutest particulars and under all circumstances to the practice of the primitive churches.

This is the familiar enedavour to find a mechanism to solve human problems in place of the creative impulses of the love of God, the love of Christ, and the love of one's brother within the heart. It is the falling back of the mind upon authority which is supposed to be in one way or other the authority of God, which can, it is imagined, be seen clearly to be the decision of God on any matter and is only disobeyed from human wilfulness and pride.

There are three chief forms taken by authority, the first two of which are revealed in the trial for heresy and expulsion of James Morison by the Secession Church, and the third invoked to justify the action of the Church of Scotland in support of Patronage which resulted in the formation of the Free Church of Scotland, both in 1843. The first is the authority of Scripture as the Word of God, taken to mean the decisiveness of any text or passage for belief or conduct. The second is the authority of the ancient Creeds taken over at the Reformation, supplemented by later Creeds or Confessions, such as the Westminster Confession of the Presbyterian Churches. The third is the authority of the State over the Church in such matters as the election of a minister to the charge of a particular congregation or parish. This was held to be the natural complement of the religious authority of the Church as by law Established, that is, accepted by the "Christian" State as set over it by God to be its moral and spiritual guide.

James Morison and the Evangelical Union.

The Secession Church, of which Robert Morison, father of James, was a minister, had broken with the Church of Scotland on the question of Patronage, but it retained the Calvinism of that Church, including the predestinarian doctrine of redemption. James, a fine scholar and gentle warm-hearted man, departed from this doctrine by preaching the universality of the Atonement, declaring that Christ died not merely for the elect or those predestinated to salvation but for all men, so that the offer of redemption should be made to everyone, which he had the natural gift of freedom of the will to accept. At his ordination there was some hesitation on the part of the Presbytery, on account of rumours of this tendency in his preaching as a student, and of a pamphlet which he published on the subject. He had only been a short time in the ministry of his church at Clerk's Lane, Kilmarnock, when, although there was strong interest and support in the

majority of his congregation, opposition developed from a minority, who appealed to the Presbytery concerning the strange new doctrines of their young minister. The Presbytery having condemned his views, he appealed to the Synod, and characteristically spent the three months before his trial before that ecclesiastical Court in writing a short work on *The Extent of the Atonement,* in which his position was built up upon a deep scholarly analysis of the relevant passages in the New Testament and buttressed by a vast number of references to the great writers and preachers both in Greek and Latin. By the decision of the Synod he was suspended from the ministry of his denomination; his reply to the Moderator, expressed with deep emotion, was:

> Sooner shall my right hand forget its cunning, and my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, than that this decision shall prevent me from preaching the glorious Gospel of Jesus Christ[3].

Morison and his church, which gathered round him, were soon joined by a few churches and ministers who shared their views; nine students of the Edinburgh Theological Hall of the Congregational Church were tried and expelled for taking the same position in their preaching. The leavening influence of the churches, which formed the Evangelical Union for mutual help, the training of men for the ministry, and for both Foreign and Home Missions to the unevangelized, resulted in the preaching of a full and free Gospel in Churches whose nominal standard was still high-and-dry Calvinism; and the Union of the Evangelical Union and the Congregational Union in 1896 was one example of this, since Congregationalism followed the line of the free evangelism of the Haldane brothers, and left the theoretic Calvinism which was the orthodoxy of the denomination, in its appropriate cold storage.

A few of the qualities of the Evangelical Union seen in its history to this day must be only briefly mentioned. One was a strong tradition of scholarship in the ministry, under the example and training of Morison himself. There was also the departure from the mechanical idea of the authority of Scripture, which reduced texts to the level of the magical spells of a not far distant tribalism, and solemnly proposed the notion that the writers were mere penmen of the Holy Spirit and not great minds and hearts like Paul's and John's, seeking to express the love of God and the mind of Christ, and thus becoming organs for the working of that life through their own natural powers. There was a high valuation of Evangelism, one of the most useful forms being weeks of meetings held by the students of the Hall indoors and in the open-air. Freed from the religious *clichés* and narrow literalism which create

[3] For the whole of this section see the excellent article, "The Morisonian Controversy" (*Trans. Cong. Hist. Soc.,* VIII. 226-236).

what Troelstch calls the "sect-type" of denomination, and guided by the scholarly training of the Hall, that missionary evangelism often gave to churches a healthy breath and stirring of Revival. There is a tradition in one of the Lanarkshire E.U. churches that a young miner, James Keir Hardie, was converted in such a movement; there were other leaders of the democratic movement of whom this is more certainly known; and there can be no question of the powerful effect upon the working-classes not merely of a simple scheme of salvation but of the personal knowledge both of the leaders and of the rank and file, of Him who said He came that men might have life and have it to the full. This account must not omit to mention the poet Burns, who to intelligent pioneers of democracy in Scotland was a mighty influence by his fierce criticism of Calvinism, his warm-hearted sympathy with all weak and wounded creatures, and his high sense of the dignity and worth of the common man—all of which he learned first from the Man of Nazareth, portrayed in the "big, ha' Bible" in the Ayrshire cottage.

The Disruption.

The foundation of the Free Church of Scotland by voluntary separation of a large minority from the Established Church of Scotland is a second instance of the conflict of the spirit and the growing life of the soul against the letter of formulæ and of secular laws, made in earlier times by religious men. It is the thrust of that spirit against literalism and legalism in the interpretation of Scripture by which its authority was defined in an earlier age. It was no empty superstition or unreasoning loyalty to the past which kept Thomas Chalmers, the outstanding leader of the movement, faithful from his ordination in 1803 till the early eighteen-thirties to the idea of a State Establishment, and able to pour eloquent abuse upon Voluntaries who refused to pay taxation for the support of the parish ministers at the demand of the State. If one is to understand this warm-hearted and honest-minded man, one must grant that he was pursuing a dream, with a hope always growing fainter, the dream of a Christian State in Scotland, of a community in which family worship would be universal, and the church would be sought by everyone as the home of the soul. In this State men would do God's will in honesty and righteousness towards each other, and the love which Jesus showed to all men would be the motive of the secure and wealthy classes in relation to their "less fortunate brethren" in the Church. Needless to say, it was a dream that faded, but to such minds as that of Chalmers its charm has probably ever lain in its foregleam of that Kingdom of Heaven upon earth, that noble and loving society of people who have the Kingdom of Christ within their hearts.

I leave to Church historians the account of the various stages of the controversy over patronage, and of the thrilling events in Edinburgh on 18th May, 1843, when for the right of congregations to choose their own spiritual leaders hundreds of ministers left their parishes, manses, and incomes, and went out in a true sense "not knowing whither they went". It was that sacrificial action which always consecrates a great moral and spiritual movement; and the power of it went far into the nineteenth century in the frequent Evangelistic campaigns over the whole country, the deep devotion to Foreign Missions, the courage and genius of its great scholars, and a true interest in social betterment. This I would link with the second main enthusiasm of Thomas Chalmers, in which he seems to me to join the line of St. Francis, Langland, and Wyclif, who drew from the fresh picture of Jesus in the Gospels, with His high valuation of the ordinary man—the principles of the equality of all men to God, the nobility of labour, and the transformation of human society through faith in love, so as to banish want and idleness, and establish the happiness of men in serving each other. The social passion of Chalmers found vent in his endeavour, before the Disruption, to abolish pauperism. His idea was to abolish the existing system of poor relief, with its compulsory assessments by the Government, the humiliating conditions in which it was given, and the degrading poor-houses, often indistinguishable in atmosphere and treatment from convict prisons. In place of this he sought to make his church, St. John's in Glasgow, responsible for all the poor in its own parish, through the voluntary gifts of the better-to-do people. Clearly this was a dream of the Church as a loving society in which rich and poor felt equal in value to Christ and to each other, and respect for each other's human dignity was maintained by mutual service. The dream, if he held it, was defeated by the unreadiness and unbelief of his age; but like that of St. Francis and the poet Langland, it was a prophecy of reality, of which that astonishing document to be issued by a Government, the Beveridge Plan, is a dim foregleam of a not impossible future for our country and for the world.

Two of America's leading historians, Profs. Allan Nevins and H. S. Commager, have collaborated in **America: The Story of a Free People* (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.), a narrative history written for laymen, and not for scholars. They have been eminently successful, and they are to be congratulated as much as is the Oxford Press, which gives us 480 pp. for 7s. 6d. We hope they will be rewarded by a wide circulation in this country, where ignorance of American history and institutions is still widespread. We have only one criticism to offer. The early part of the book gives the impression that the authors said: "We're writing for lay people, so every noun must have an adjective", and then with a list of adjectives before them assigned them to their places after careful discussion!

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

A STUDY OF DIFFERENCES

BETWEEN THE EVANGELICAL AND REFORMED CHURCH AND THE CONGREGATIONAL CHRISTIAN CHURCHES IN FAITH AND PRACTICE.

In the faith of the Evangelical and Reformed Church are strains of inheritance from four of the most celebrated of the Sixteenth Century Reformers, Luther and Calvin, Zwingli and Melanchthon.

It is not strange, therefore, that in the section of the constitution of that church which is entitled "Doctrine" the great symbols of both the Lutheran and the Reformed schools of thought should be named as standards—the Heidelberg Catechism, Luther's Catechism, and the Augsburg Confession.

In the faith of the Congregational Christian Churches, on the other hand, are to be found inheritances not from Continental but from English and Scottish Protestantism. Congregationalism, though it broke with Anglicanism ecclesiastically, shares with Anglicanism many theological premises and practical attitudes. It was a mildly Puritan rather than an iconoclastic Anabaptist movement which settled New England. Similarly, the three branches of the Christian Connection brought with them into their united Church more than they left behind of the characteristics of the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian groups from which they severally came. The General Council of Congregational Christian Churches in its own way unites the Protestantism of the British Isles, as the Evangelical and Reformed Church unites the Protestantism of Europe proper.

When one seeks, however, in the constitution of the General Council today, reference to the great symbols of British Protestantism, he seeks in vain. The Cambridge Platform of 1648, in which the Congregationalists of that time adopted *in toto* the doctrines of the Westminster Confession, and so declared themselves Calvinists, would seem, for instance, to provide an admirable historical standard to which Congregationalists might point today. All the principles of Congregational polity are set forth therein. But no: there is no mention in the constitution of any creed, ancient or modern, whatsoever, and instead and to the contrary it is explicitly stated that the churches find their union in "the acceptance of Christianity as primarily a way of life" and not in "uniformity of theological opinion or any uniform practice of ordinances". For a definition of that way of life, one is referred

simply to "the Bible" in which is to be found "the supreme rule of faith and life".

From the fact that the two constitutions differ at this point, the one citing, the other omitting mention of, historic confessions, it might be interred that there is an underlying difference between the two communions in matters of faith; but this, I believe, would be a conjecture without foundation. The difference lies not in the area of faith itself, but in the attitude of the two denominations to formal statements of faith. That, however, is a matter which does not call for consideration until the practices of the two communions engage our study.

The fact that the Congregational Christian General Council does not set forth a particularized statement of faith at the head of its constitution does not argue that Congregational Christians are not interested in creeds and do not have any. The plain historical fact is that they have been prolific creed makers and ready creed users. They have known that the gospel, in order to be made socially available, must be expressed in terms intellectually apprehensible, and have not hesitated to cast it in mnemonic creedal form when necessary.

Generally speaking, every Congregational Christian Church has its own creed: *quot ecclesiae tot confessiones*. It has been said that every individual Congregational Christian has his creed, and there is a measure of truth in the remark. It is at least because of multiplicity of creeds rather than of any distrust of them that no one of them is selected to be named in the constitution of the General Council—no one, that is, except the Bible itself.

In spite of this multiplicity of form, however, there is an indubitable consensus of thought among Congregational Christians. The communion is one of the few in America which is not distraught by theological controversy. The creed of 1913 is generally acceptable to all, and is used in the Sunday morning worship of many churches. So well recognized is this consensus that the General Council (1940) has set apart a Commission to draw up a thorough-going Statement of Faith as soon as possible.

If the Heidelberg Catechism, Luther's Catechism, and the Augsburg Confession be taken for general substance of doctrine, especially with the proviso that at their points of difference any one of them may be followed, and the presupposition that all are to be conceived as expressing the Word of God, they may fairly be said to represent the consensus of Congregational Christian opinion.

It is true that few contemporary members of Congregational Christian Churches could be found who could accept every thought which is common to these Sixteenth Century symbols. They could not, for instance, answer the question, "Whence then proceeds this depravity of human nature?" in quite so pre-Darwinian a manner as does the Heidelberg Catechism: "From the fall and disobedience of our first parents, Adam and Eve, in Paradise". They would probably feel that any attempt to interpret this answer in modern terms would pervert the meaning it had for those who originally wrote it and would therefore be impossible for men of integrity today. Such instances of dissent in secondary matters might be multiplied.

But is not this attitude, which balks at accepting certain details of the Confession, while gladly embracing the Confession as a whole, as prevalent among the people of the Evangelical and Reformed Church as it would be among Congregational Christians? We believe so. The Catechism is significant today to most of us, not for its *minutiae* but for its exposition of the broad and fundamental relationships of God and man and the world.

The people of the Evangelical and Reformed Church and those of the Congregational Christian Churches read the same books, follow the same spiritual leadership, send their children to the same kinds of school and college. They are both alike the offspring of the Protestant Reformation. Their history as agents of union between churches has given each a certain catholic breadth of outlook. It would be strange indeed if they did not hold a common faith.

It is in the realm of practice that differences are more likely to appear. Little divergence is seen, however, either in the realm of ritual or ministry. By the constitution of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, "congregations are allowed freedom of worship". Here again a consensus of opinion among Congregational Churches may be taken for granted, for they have enjoyed freedom of worship from of old.

Both communions use this freedom to the same ends. In some churches in each communion may be found the simple and austere worship of early American frontier life. In others the impulse of the liturgical movement has been felt, and numerous forms suggested by the more Catholic traditions are employed. In all of the churches on both sides of the denominational line, however, the Reformers' insight that it is by faith and not by works that we are justified, is the presupposition of worship. This, and the further insight that the Church is a priesthood of believers, gives to Evangelical and Reformed as well as to Congregational Christian churches, whether they be more or less ritualistically inclined, a forthrightness of devotion in an unclerical atmosphere which marks them as belonging to one great tradition. Ministers of the two communions find it easy to exchange pulpits, and lay people to worship in the churches of either denomination.

Little of difference is to be found in the two communions as they face the vast needs of the world in the Spirit of Christ. Each one is committed to the Christian education of youth. Each one regards the Christian family as the fundamental unit of the Christian Church. Each believes in an educated ministry. Each is sensitive to the social needs of the passing generations. Each has developed missions at home and abroad. Both believe that the one great need of the world and the only hope of the world is Jesus Christ. This shared consciousness has caused the two denominations to create and sustain similar ministries.

If any difference in basic attitude is to be found between the two communions, it is probably in the realm of polity, and that not in the legislative or administrative branches, which follow the pattern of a representative democracy, but in the area of personal and group relationships, which our fathers called *disciplina*.

If the Evangelical and Reformed Church is a highly connectional system in which majorities or appointed executives rule the whole, leaving the minorities and the masses who do not enjoy executive positions to obey as best they may, there is a difference between the two systems. But, though it must be left to a qualified member of the Evangelical and Reformed Church to describe the actual working of its polity, I, as a somewhat intimate observer of that communion from outside, should be more than astonished to learn that any such degree of centralization prevailed. From the outside, the minorities and the people in general seem to enjoy as many privileges as they do in the Congregational Christian fellowship.

According to Congregational Christian theory, God may speak through the individual saint to the congregation, or through the congregation to the saint. Normally, He uses both channels. Correspondingly, He may speak to the fellowship of churches, that is, the synod, through the individual

church, or to the individual church through the synod—and normally he speaks through both. He may speak to the conference of churches or synod through the General Council or General Synod, and vice versa.

On these premises, through three and more centuries, a theocracy has been developed and maintained in Congregationalism. The only head of the church is Jesus Christ, but He is not conceived to have chosen any hierarchy or majority to be His special vicegerents on earth: He may at times choose to place in the humblest member of the church more authority, because He speaks through him, than in any humanly appointed or elected governor. It is for this reason that all persons and groups of persons within the Church are conceived to be on an equality under Christ. There are no "higher" and "lower" judicatories. No commands are issued by the General Council to the Conferences of Churches, or by the Conferences themselves to the individual churches. Authority is freely delegated by one body to another, but only so long as the former judges the latter to be acting in conformity to the authority of Christ. The situation never arises wherein a Congregational Christian believes he has no right to appeal from an ecclesiastical ruling to the judgment of Christ Himself. The whole body of the church is held together by mutual loyalty, and the key word is co-operation.

It will immediately be asked what course is followed when a minority deems it unwise or wrong to co-operate with the majority, any part with any other part. Acting upon the premise that loyalty to Christ is the first consideration, the two groups endeavour to hold their differences in abeyance until through mutual consultation and discussion, the Holy Spirit has revealed to them a higher synthesis in which their disagreements may be resolved. If the nature of the disharmony is such, however, that they cannot continue in the common worship and service of Christ, they have recourse to brethren who represent a wider fellowship, precisely as in a presbyteral system disputants turn to a higher "court". This body attempts to reconcile them. If it fails to do so, appeal may be made to a body representing a still larger fellowship, *etc.* If all attempts at reconciliation finally fail, there is nothing for it but that the two groups in disagreement should separate, but if they are Congregational Christian at heart, they do not leave the fellowship, nor do they part without a continuing hope that in due time the Holy Spirit will reveal His will with sufficient clarity to allow them to enter once more into full co-operation with one another.

This type of discipline may not appear to be essentially different from that which is employed in the more closely connectional systems of church government; but as a matter of fact it does have two effects which are unique.

The standing of each body as over against all other bodies in Congregationalism allows usages to grow up in that body which are peculiar to itself. When these prove to be the occasion of tension between that body and others in the denomination, some unifying synthesis must be discovered, as already suggested. Often enough, however, the tension is felt to be of a health-giving kind, or does not exist at all; often it is felt that the peculiar circumstances of the group in question warrant a deviation from customary practice; and a duality or multiformity of practice is established within the communion, such as would be the despair of any denomination interested especially in uniformity.

There is no better illustration of this development of variety within unity than that already mentioned: the attitude of the communion toward creedal forms is that any such form is permissible provided it adequately symbolizes

the great truths of the Bible, and that any individual church may discover a way of wording its creed which is peculiarly well suited to it. This of course does not outlaw the great historic creeds, which have their own place in the larger church. The result is multiplicity but not chaos, for the creeds are not testimonies to individualism but individual witnesses to a common loyalty. This is a practical result of the co-operative type of discipline which informs the Congregational Christian churches.

It is probable that in actuality the Evangelical and Reformed Church functions almost exactly as does the Congregational Christian Church. Its constitution theoretically seems to place greater emphasis on the idea of the judicatory than would be fostered in a Congregational system, but my own observation is that each judicatory wields its authority with such Christian forbearance as to make itself indistinguishable in the manner of its functioning from the corresponding Congregational Christian legislative or administrative group. There seems to be in all parts of the communion the same apprehension of the dangers of over-centralization that one finds written into the very constitution of the Congregational Christian Churches.

The key to a plan of union between the two communions is found in the constitution of the Evangelical and Reformed Church. Section 3 reads in part: "Wherever these doctrinal standards (the Heidelberg Catechism, Luther's Catechism and the Augsburg (Confession) differ, ministers, members and congregations, in accordance with the liberty of conscience inherent in the gospel, are allowed to adhere to the interpretation of one of these confessions".

The beauty of the principle which underlies such a plan is that unity is arrived at without call for compromise and without severing the cords which unite the members of the union to their own past. If the church which might be created from the two denominations we represent honoured that principle in all parts of its constitution, it would conserve all the value of its traditions and yet in union find new strength for Christ. There is no fundamental discrepancy between us in matters of faith. Again, the practices of the two communions are in very large measure identical. If the differences are in areas of secondary importance, it might well be left to the people "in accordance with the liberty of conscience inherent in the Gospel" to follow the way of the erstwhile Evangelical and Reformed or Congregational Christian Church.

If the differences are in the stratum of basic principle, the union could hardly be consummated, and we should, with infinite regret on my own part, have to forgo the thought of it. But I do not believe they are. The only possible divergence I discern is, as I have said, in the realm of discipline, the general manner of our ecclesiastical life. It would perhaps be a test of our own thought upon this matter if we asked ourselves whether, in the spirit of another sentence of Section 3 of the Evangelical and Reformed Constitution—"In each case the final norm is the Word of God"—it would be acceptable, in the preamble to any constitution which might be adopted by the combined churches, to make a statement to the following effect: "This constitution is set forth as a witness to the faith and practice of the church, but it is at all points subject to the judgment of God, made known or yet to be made known, and the refusal of any member or members of the church on the ground of Christian principle to adhere to it at any point by no means dissolves their fellowship with the church but only announces the need for mutual enquiry into the mind of Christ upon the point of issue".

I know that the Congregational Christian, and I believe that the Re-

formed and Evangelical Church, would find no stumbling-block in such a statement. If that is the case, it is safe to say that there are no differences between the two communions so great as to prevent organic union. On the divine side and on the human, union is called for. We cannot with impunity disregard the words of our Lord if we are to do His work well. And we know that the future belongs to those churches sufficiently wide spread to look after their members wherever they may go. "Unto him that hath shall be given". The union of the two communions, the one with its Continental, the other with its Anglo-Saxon, ancestry would proclaim the Supranational character of the Church and fulfil a dream of the Reformation. If there is to be in the United States of America a United Church of America, I know no communions better prepared to establish it than the Evangelical and Reformed and the Congregational Christian Churches.

DOUGLAS HORTON.

OPEN CHURCHES.

IS A NEW CONSIDERATION NECESSARY?

THE plea for the opening of churches during the week has on the whole been received with sympathy by ministers and office-bearers, though practical reasons have not always made the plan possible. How far the opportunity for private worship has been taken advantage of is not very definitely known. It would, however, be interesting to learn more of the value of this movement from those concerned, to have suggestions how it may be made more helpful or explanations why certain expectations were not realized.

No one can overlook the need of quiet places, pools of silence in the present torrent and swirl of hasteful activities and profound emotions. With a special understanding people recall the words of Jesus to His disciples, "Come ye apart and rest awhile".

But some may wonder if we have blindly followed a fashion without considering whether the Protestant church-building or the outlook of the Reformed system corresponds to the desire. Other Churches, the Roman and the Anglican, for example, have specific ideas as to the localization of worship: material things are invested with a special sacredness and become signs and channels for religious meditation and blessing; there are side-chapels, pictures, praying cushions. In practice, it may be granted, the Protestant often shows a devotion to the church-building, its furniture and pews, with a tenacity unsurpassed elsewhere: like the Psalmist he is ready to say:

> Thy saints take pleasure in her stones,
> Her very dust to them is dear.

In theory, however, the Protestant denies any overruling spiritual significance in the place or the details of his worship. Though appreciating profoundly the guidance of custom in attending a church where prayer is wont to be made, the inspiration of fellowship there, and the compelling example of our Lord, he contends for the true worth as well as the liberty of worship wherever that high mood be sought and found. There is something of sublime encouragement in the story of the busy mother who discovered that she could enter into the heavenly places by sitting down for a few moments in her kitchen and throwing an apron over her head.

I do not mention this story by way of discouraging a practice that many people find helpful. Rather would I desire to see a special development of the arrangements for "Open Churches". In the past our buildings have

been true centres for public worship; we need not be ashamed of the old-fashioned if somewhat misleading name, "meeting-houses", for in them people did meet with God as well as with one another. But if the devotional life of the individual is to be taken out of the home, owing to modern conditions of one kind and another, it would be well that arrangements for the care of these precious spiritual interests should be guided with sincere thoughtfulness along lines appropriate to the genius of our historic faith.

Now there are some whose ideal of a Church building is one of simplicity, austere but not therefore in any way forbidding. Plain blank walls broken with plain glass windows undoubtedly carry their own wealth of suggestion. A pulpit of one kind or another is necessary, but when the Sacraments are observed an ordinary table and a decent bowl suffice, the former covered with a seemly white cloth and the latter attended with a simple napkin. Such homeliness, indicating the family and household nature of our religion, has left a deep imperishable mark on the lives of many in a generation that is perhaps passing away.

Yet we have become today more conscious of the need for beauty. Our faith tells of Resurrection as well as of Sacrifice and Agony: colour and life break out of the darkness and adorn the imprisoned. "If the Church services were made more of a Festival, it might mean more to the Javanese Christians", writes a missionary, and his words have a wide application. To have the Word and the Sacraments ever present to us through the symbolism of the Pulpit, the Baptismal Font, and the Communion Table can offend none but encourage all.

Should we then have pictures on the walls or the roof? With this question certain difficulties assail us. Some would shake their heads, invoking the Second Commandment, while others point to the controversies over image-worship. It is true that in the early days when Christians gathered in the Catacombs, religious sketches and pictures decorated the walls, though the historian remarks a certain shyness in representing the figure of our Lord, a shyness shown in the use of such symbols as the Good Shepherd.

In the Sunday Schools no difficulty has been experienced. It is recognized that what the eye sees the heart more easily remembers. Happily the youthful mind does not dwell on the problems and mysteries which may perplex the theologian. Whether similar representations might not prove useful to guide and inspire the thoughts of the adult worshipper without endangering the purity of his faith is worth considering in the new situation created by Open Churches. Neither the danger of veneration on the one hand nor familiarity on the other would seem to be involved.

Would it be possible to have articles of historic and religious importance set out on view to stimulate reflection? In Iona Cathedral is the stone used by St. Columba as his pillow. At the heart of the Reformation, in the Cathedral of St. Pierre in Geneva, the chair of Calvin may be seen at the foot of the pulpit. In the Scots Church at Madeira in a glass case on the wall is a famous Bible that once rested in a hidey-hole under the hearth-stone in the days of persecution. Regimental flags and famous tombstones are to be found in other churches. Some may not possess or even desire to possess these emblems of valour and fame, and yet be able and willing to display something commemorative of their history and witness.

Difference of opinion will inevitably be felt concerning these details, but on four points I believe that unanimity may be established. In some outward and visible fashion there should be set forth, first, the Word; second, the two Sacraments; third, the Church universal, suffering and triumphant;

fourth, a personal application to the conscience and feeling of the worshipper, whether alone or in company. Dr. Edwyn Bevan thinks the Protestant Churches have not satisfied the emotional needs and the demand associated with the third point mentioned, "have not given a vivid thought of the great company of those who have passed into the unseen as still in effective solidarity with the Church on earth".

Others may have suggestions to make. For myself I think there is room for Scripture verses painted on the walls or on scrolls hung on the walls somewhat after the manner of Chinese banners. In the olden days I seem to remember churches with the Lord's Prayer on one side of the pulpit and the Ten Commandments on the other. We have our Wayside Pulpit with its message outside the church, why should there not be some silent witness of the Word inside for the silent worshipper? The passages might follow the Christian Year, or be the texts of the preacher on the preceding Sunday, or some utterance appropriate to the events of the day. Little expense would be involved, no controversy would be aroused, the private thoughts of the worshipper would not be disturbed. Out of the silence would come rebuke, companionship, guidance and comfort. Suitable literature for meditation, of which there is an abundant supply, might also be set out on a table inside the church.

Perhaps we may learn from other lands and faiths. I have read of a temple in China with the significant name, "The hall in which one knows one's own heart": on the ceiling is a slate with scrolls, "Heaven cannot be cheated", "All intrigues and dark plots are ultimately of no avail", "Man has a thousand plans, heaven but one".

A. W. McClymont.

THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE ASSOCIATION.

Rather more than a year ago, a "Theological Literature Association" was formed to stimulate the provision and circulation of the several categories of literature designed to further Christian faith and practice. The interest of a number of leading theologians at the universities, of some distinguished lay apologists, and of others, was enlisted, and, despite the difficulties of the times, it has been possible to take initial steps towards the preparation of some important books. It is felt that the time is now come for making the existence of the Association and its objects more widely known. At present it consists of a Council of about 40 members, of whom the following are serving as the Executive Committee: The Dean of Christ Church (Chairman), Prof. C. H. Dodd (Vice-Chairman), Prof. C. E. Raven, Canon F. A. Cockin, Mr. W. G. Symons, Dr. Norman Sykes, Fr. Victor White, O.P., Dr. Newton Flew, with Dr. F. L. Cross (Pusey House, Oxford) and the Rev. A. R. Vidler (St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, Chester) as Hon. Secretaries. The Committee is anxious both to learn of any whose purposes or interests would lead them to wish to be kept in contact with the work of the Association, and also to receive suggestions as to tasks in which the services of the Association would likely to be of use. A leaflet giving further particulars will be gladly sent to anyone who applies to either of the Hon. Secretaries.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS

COMMITTEES.

I THINK I had better begin as the novelists do—by saying that the characters within are entirely fictitious and not the portraits of any living persons! Only it would be no more true than it is—very often—in the case of the novelists. When I looked at the first draft of this article I found myself saying, "They'll think that is A.B.C., and that X.Y.Z." They weren't, but there was sufficient resemblance to justify the opinion. And of course a size 7½ cap fits a good many heads! I determined therefore to omit some pictures which might have been deemed photographic, and people mentioned by name will be those whose committee work is being done in heaven—for there must be committees in heaven: otherwise how could you-know-who be perfectly happy?

Recently I quoted the Japanese to whom the Englishman was explaining the doctrine of the Trinity. He remarked, "Oh, and so the English have a committee for that also"! I know no country so addicted to committees as our own. Is anything *ever* done in this country without a Committee? When a denomination sets out to raise half-a-million pounds the first thing to be done is to appoint a committee, which immediately appoints a sub-committee, and then, long before the half-million is a cloud bigger than a man's hand, another committee is appointed, with its own bantling sub-committee, to discuss how the money should be used. And the grades of committee have their own interest. Did not the dear old lady in the country whose son was a M.P. tell her friends with pride that her boy was rising in the world because he had been made a member of a Select Committee?

What then is a committee? It has been defined as "a body of people who spend hours making minutes". We have all known committees like that. Such a definition makes me tremble when I think of the time I have spent in committee work during the last thirty years. There have been church committees, denominational committees, education committees concerned with all grades and many types of education, conference committees, cricket club committees (a special article could be written about these), entertainment committees, debating society committees, and a legion of "*ad hocs*". During all the hours thus spent I've learnt much, and made many friends. It is what I have learnt of my fellows about which I am going to talk most in these garrulous pages.

It was my good fortune at a comparatively early age to be a member of one of the best committees I've known—the Executive Committee of the Lancashire Congregational Union, then, and I believe still, the most efficient County Union in England, which is a considerable thing for a Yorkshireman to admit. It is hard to say what made "the Executive" so effective. Perhaps the Chairman: the Lancashire Union has the strange custom of making its Treasurer, and not its Chairman, preside over its Executive; that makes for continuity, and Ephraim Hindle was a good Chairman. Perhaps it was the fact that we did not smoke: I have known committees where some of the leading members, who had to speak a great deal, did not even remove their pipes to speak; often we couldn't tell what they said and had to console ourselves by presuming that we hadn't lost much. Perhaps it was the Secretary, for A. J. Viner was efficiency personified: there was nothing

slack and no loose ends about anything of which he was in charge. He was a dedicated spirit, who gave himself to the service of men; he liked his own way, but we had to acknowledge that it was generally the best way; and the Executive was so strong that he was never more than a powerful Prime Minister. Accused sometimes of being a dictator, he was scrupulously careful about constitutional forms; he would never, for instance, propose a resolution himself, no matter how keen he was on some particular action, or to "get a move on". Memories of the Committee come back to me as I write. Viner urging that a minister should be put on List A because of the fine work he was doing: "This is the sort of man he is: he had a big open-air meeting and was announcing the collection, and he said, 'May I remind the collectors that at open-air meetings they always begin on the outside of the crowd?' ". Or his annual argument with Gerard Ford about the grant to Church Aid, Mr. Ford always winning because on this point Viner was unduly touchy and the layman ever his winsome self. And there were others. The District Secretaries always used to pilot the business of their Districts, and generally they made a slick job of it: one of them was prosy, and used to take as much time as all the rest; almost as soon as he rose one member regularly slipped out, no doubt for the forbidden smoke; there came swift nemesis, however, for the escapist was appointed Secretary, and then there was escape no more. Or there was the good, if unctuous, brother who came on the Executive for a year as Chairman of his District, and appealed for the increase of a grant for the church for which he was responsible, "I beseech you, dear brethren, deal very tenderly with—Timbuctoo". *That* finished Timbuctoo's chances with a Lancashire Committee.

Since those far-off days it has been interesting to note how types recur, and how alike men are—and women. The other day I was in committee—scarcely a religious committee this—when the commissionaire put his head round the door and beckoned to me. "Which is Sir P.Q.?", he whispered hoarsely, mentioning a name familiar wherever English is spoken. I nodded to the front of the room. He said, "Could you tell him that Lady P.Q. is on the 'phone, and she wants to know how long she's going to be kept waiting?" I duly delivered the message, making it, I trust, a little more affectionate and less peremptory. Sir P.Q. responded with a grunt, but within thirty seconds he rose and departed. But that is scarcely about committees.

I have said there are types which recur. There is the seconder of resolutions, for example. I sat on a committee for many years next to a man who never contributed a single idea, but who seconded innumerable resolutions. His cousin, no doubt, is the man who cannot refrain from saying the obvious; it is in everybody's mind and receiving consideration, but he must put it into words. Another of his relatives is the inveterate speaker, who feels called upon to express his opinion on every item of business. In unregenerate days the younger members of the Council of the Congregational Union of England and Wales used to count the number of times some of the older members spoke; one year I remember, Fleming Williams and Ryland Adkins were at the top of the poll with 16; 15 was scored by—but he must not be mentioned, because he's still batting! Both Fleming Williams and Ryland Adkins had generally a point worth making; would it were always so with all! But there are those who never seem able to forget themselves in the matter under debate: they always want to express their views, they are sensitive when confuted, and annoyed when beaten. One type it has rarely been my lot to meet—the schemer, who looks on a committee as a means to further his own plans, who studies the moment of

his intervention, tries to spring a vote when he sees a chance of a snap majority, the professional politician, in short. Or there is the man with the amendment mind, who must be "agin the government": if the motion is "9d. for 4d." he moves "9d. for 3d.", if for a meeting on Thursday, he proposes Wednesday.

Then there is the rigid type, the man of definite opinions, without any resilience or give-and-take. He generally wants to know "what we did last year"; all change to him is for the worse, all experiment dangerous.

Over against all these is the man of fertile mind and ready speech, who has views and can express them, but who realizes that he does not possess all the truth. He has opinions, but he is not opinionated; he realizes that the purpose of a committee is to pool wisdom and obtain a *consensus*. The ideal committee man is a boon to any society; he is regular, punctual, thoughtful, considerate in every way; he comes prepared and ready to co-operate; he is not peppery, "thin-skinned", or obstinate; he is conciliatory and adaptable, and while true to his convictions willing to reason and to make accommodations where necessary. Get a committee of such men, and you have democracy *in excelsis*, for a committee is a democratic process both sound and necessary.

In work of this kind the passage of the years is always forcing itself on notice. It is stirring to see youth coming into the field, but pathetic indeed is the sight of failing powers. Here is a man alert, sensitive, always speaking to the point; a generation goes by, and the fire has gone and the grip has loosened; still he is always speaking, but is now dull, repetitive, incoherent; and the younger men who never knew him in his prime are impatient and wonder why he is tolerated. Must we all be like that, think ourselves the exceptions, whom time cannot touch, and deem that we are even as we were?

> Let me not live until my flame lacks oil
> To be the snuff of younger spirits.

Better than that almost is it to be a sleeper: then at least one does not interrupt the march of events, the progress of business. I remember two occasions on which Chairmen slept. In the first case the Chairman woke to find a telegram resting on the crook of his arm; the boy had marched in, handed it to him, and placed it there in the sight of the audience while the lecture proceeded; I remember nothing quite like the startled amazement on the Chairman's face. It might have been an egg he found laid there in February, 1943. On the second, the best-informed man of our times was speaking, and finding himself irritated by the persistent ringing of a telephone bell. He turned and said, abruptly, "Can't you stop that telephone, J.?" But J. was fast asleep, and his wife had to come to the rescue—as wives generally do in time of need.

This naturally leads to Chairmen, on whom much depends. One of the best I have known was a woman. She presided over a Committee I had to attend in Boston last year, and did it remarkably well. The Archbishop of Canterbury is an excellent Chairman. Perhaps the best in all my experience was Josiah Stamp: I remember an afternoon when the problem under discussion was complex and many-sided, with many pitfalls; after a couple of hours' talk everything seemed involved and intricate. Then Stamp spoke for three minutes: "The salient points that emerge are this and this and this, and it seems that the best thing to do is that and that and that"—and we all felt there was no more to be said. At the ordinary meeting the ideal Chairman is said to be "one who occupies space but not time". More than this is required of the Committee Chairman: he should be more

familiar with the business than any of its members, and by crisp outline and summary he can save much time and talk. Stamp had these gifts in abundant measure—a power of seizing the crucial points, and a sound instinct for the possible way forward.

It is well to remember that circumstances alter Chairmen as well as cases. The businesslike Chairman on his home ground comes to London. His train home is not until 6 p.m., and he doesn't want stumps to be drawn much before that: so he allows business to drag, and the busy men round the table who have work waiting at their offices become irritable and give less than their best. Even rooms seem to make a difference. Some lend themselves to committee work, which, at its best, is done round a table. And times too. In my salad days a wise man warned me never to let deacons' or business meetings continue after 9 p.m.: "Then men are tired and not at their best; they've done a day's work, and it is after nine that tempers begin to fray". It was sound advice.

There are men who despise committees, men who from the superior summits of scornful seclusion—there, to borrow an Americanism, I sure said a sibilant mouthful, and one which, in more dignified pages of this journal, would have come to a speedy end—these 's' men slight those who do the routine work of the societies and organizations to which they belong. Such men are easily recognizable. Not having had corners rubbed off by constant discussion with men of equal minds they find it difficult to engage in any co-operative enterprise. Few men would not be improved by the discipline committees bring. Looking back, I certainly do not regret the hours I've spent in making minutes. No doubt some of it *has* been wasted, for I've known committees that were rather like the League of Nations—they touched nothing they did not adjourn. But I gladly recognize how much my fellow-committee men have contributed to my education, and acknowledge how patient they have been with my shortcomings: I trust I myself am more patient, more tolerant and more considerate, as well as wiser, through their training. I realize that I have learnt much about men and methods, something about time—and not a little about eternity.

ALBERT PEEL.

P S.—Since writing the above I have read Dr. Joseph Needham's *Time: The Refreshing River*, in which he says, "However fascists may laugh, there is something divine about a committee", affixing the footnote, "That is why I like that famous dictum of Conrad Noel's that the universe itself is ruled by a committee".

DEEP UNTO DEEP.

Sometimes, we know not whence or how,
There comes to those who seek eternal truth
An hour of insight, far transcending thought,
When glory fills life's inner room with light.
Then does the pulse of all the universe
Flow in the rhythmic beating of our veins;
Then does the course of our true being sweep
As on a mighty and a heaving tide
Of an immeasurable sea; then God,
Veiling His brightness, lest as fluttering moths
We burn our wings at Love's consuming fire,
In the profound is near.

A. LANDON.

WORTH NOTING FROM RECENT BOOKS

Thus the spirit, rather than the letter, of the Catholic idea of Church-order, emerges with fresh meaning from recent research, with not a little fresh evidence before it. It is a form of Catholicism which includes, and no longer excludes, the great ideas connected with the freedom of the Spirit, which are rooted in primitive Christianity, and which the Protestant Reformation has helped us in modern times to recover. We are thus encouraged and enabled to take in hand that larger, more many-sided, more-elastic, and more-vital synthesis of different aspects of the full spiritual reality of Church-life. For that reality has never yet been fully and consciously embodied and lived out in the order of any past age of the Church, since Apostolic days. "Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus", is still-less applicable as an historical test of Catholic order than it is of Catholic doctrine. It is only in the depths of the religious consciousness, as shown in the fruits of true Christian piety and obedience to conscience, that it has any validity in the realm of experience or of coherent theory.

J. Vernon Bartlet, *Church Life and Church-Order.*

Christianity said to itself: this free government by the Holy Spirit is something quite unpredictable and unreliable. If I trust myself to Him alone, it might well happen that one day I shall find myself on the rocks.

I must organize, so that I know where I am!

When the Holy Spirit, life by the free gift of God, was the controlling principle, then there was a congregation of Christians.

But when it went in for life insurance and organized itself then appeared Christianity.

When real crises arose (and to-day there is a desperately serious crisis), and men turned to Christianity, and inquired after its authority, it was found to have no authority, because the Holy Spirit is no longer there, for men no longer trust to Him alone.

The Holy Spirit is the Lord high above all lords. He reigns alone, or not at all.

For centuries we have grown so unaccustomed to the Holy Spirit, that we don't realize His absence.

John Maarten, *The Abolition of Christianity.*

. . . while the Javanese Nationalists hate the Japanese they have no intention of living after the war in a world where the old colour lines are permitted. "Count us up and think it over", they said to Mr. Abend. "There are 450,000,000 Chinese; 340,000,000 natives in India; in Thailand and Indo-China are another 32,000,000 people; Burma and Malaya have more than 20,000,000; we in the Indies are 70,000,000, the Japanese are 70,000,000, and the Coreans nearly 25,000,000 more. . . . If we are betrayed by the eventual peace, then some Asiatic nation will arise as a genuine and unselfish emancipator, and the ensuing conflict will make the present war seem like only an amateurish rehearsal". At the end of such a war the white man would find himself in the Jim Crow seats.

Herbert Agar, *A Time for Greatness.*

CURRENT LITERATURE

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master-spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(*The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.*)

J. D. Jones of Bournemouth. A Memoir. By ARTHUR PORRITT. Independent Press. 10s.

Church-Life and Church-Order during the First Four Centuries. By JAMES VERNON BARTLET. Edited, with a Memoir, by C. J. Cadoux. Blackwell. 15s.

Inside the Left. By FENNER BROCKWAY. Allen & Unwin. 15s.

Mr. Arthur Porritt had a far from easy task in writing this memoir, for not long before his death Dr. Jones's autobiography had skimmed off the cream; a practised pen, however, has given us a rapid and readable account of one who lived for his pulpit, his church, and his denomination. There are many contributors to the volume: Dr. Berry writes of his colleague as "A Statesman of Congregationalism", and others describe Dr. Jones as preacher, pastor, colleague, educationalist, and (Dean Hough) as "Christian Cosmopolitan". The book is rounded off by fourteen sermons, which seem characteristic of their writer.

There will be a warm welcome for the volume, not merely in Lincoln and Bournemouth, where Dr. Jones had his remarkable ministries, but throughout the denomination, where his initials were a household word. It has been wise to include the sermons, for it is as preacher Dr. Jones has been best known, and many preachers will desire to discover the secret of his hold on a great congregation. We doubt whether the reading of any sermons will reveal this, though the searcher will learn much from them. Mr. Porritt mentions that he examined two hundred sermons all written *currente calamo* without a single erasure; but even then it was always a marvel how Dr. Jones could read so easily that the hearer scarcely knew he was reading. Mr. E. H. Jeffs puts his finger on the spot when he speaks of Dr. Jones's preaching as biblical: it was essentially so; few men knew the Bible as well as "J.D."; its language came naturally to his lips, and one part of it elucidated another.

His services to Congregationalism—to its ministers, to the country churches, to its administration and the development of its organization—have passed into history. Few denominations have had a more devoted servant. Blessed with robust health until well over three-score years and ten, he was unsparing in his labours for the churches: in journeyings oft he came to know them and their problems as probably no man had done before him. We have heard him described as "the greatest Congregationalist of our time": superlatives are unwise, however, and it is too early yet—to speak only of those who have left us—to judge the comparative service of Fairbairn, Dale, Horton, Allon, Parker, and Bartlet. But why should we compare? We can give thanks for them all, and be proud of them, and not least of him whom this volume worthily commemorates.

Only those who know the stupendous task Dr. Vernon Bartlet's manuscripts presented to editors and compositors can appreciate to the full the labour involved in Dr. C. J. Cadoux's edition of Bartlet's Birkbeck Lectures. And the debt we owe to Dr. Cadoux for retrieving for us some of the most representative of Bartlet's work is multiplied by the masterly biographical memoir he has prefixed and by a characteristically thorough bibliography. It is safe to say that most of Bartlet's old pupils will turn to the memoir first, and equally safe to prophesy that they will not be disappointed, while those who did not know Bartlet will get a picture of him as man and scholar both life-like and adequate.

The regrets expressed, in our own pages and elsewhere, that Bartlet, with his extensive and detailed scholarship and sound and sensitive judgment, left so little in print are in a measure mitigated by the publication of these lectures. They were delivered in 1924, and in content—and so delightfully in form too—they enshrine views Bartlet consistently held, and expounded to many generations of Mansfield men. We have the parentheses, the qualifications, the careful balancing, the adverb delicately introduced to shade an opinion—all bringing back the familiar voice, and all of them insisting that one reading will not suffice to draw all the meaning from these strung-out sentences.

Not that Bartlet cannot be direct and incisive. Thus:

> The story of Montanism has its lessons of warning to all, if especially to those who try to be true to the Spirit by adhering to past forms, as if these were God's last word.

Already we have compared Bartlet and Hort, and in some senses the lectures are an exposition of Hort's dictum of "the futility of endeavouring to make the Apostolic history into a set of authoritative precedents". Bartlet stresses that Christianity is distinctive as a religion in that it is "mediated under the form, not of a law, but of a unique historic personality". Then he adds the significant words:

> For that personality not only is embodied, as regards its historic manifestation, in an abiding written form, but also works in the Spirit communicated to the society or Church which was created by the action of the same Spirit. Thus the controlling Spirit of Christ continues to live as an interpretative power in the Church, enlightening it as to the true meaning alike of its Founder's life and teaching, and of its own tradition of life and order to which these have given birth.

For his conclusion see under "Worth Noting"; and once again, thanks to Dr. Cadoux.

Naturally we found much of interest in Mr. Brockway's account of "thirty years of platform, press, prison, and parliament", but the book was also and quite unexpectedly disappointing. Mr. Brockway rarely shows gratitude and scarcely ever gives unqualified praise: at his school (Eltham) he learnt nothing but Rugger; there is no acknowledgment that Congregationalism, through *The Examiner*, Whitefield's, or Claremont, rendered him any real service in his youth; Ramsay MacDonald receives scathing treatment, and other Labour leaders, when they are mentioned at all, are little better off; Sir Stafford Cripps has gifts, but . . . The result is that before the end there is an air of "I, even I only am left"; not even Scottish Presbyterianism has been more fissiparous, and more narrow and intolerant, than the Left (Left Outside, Left Inside, Left Centre, or whichever group it is to which Mr. Brockway has adhered: the varied initials cover the pages like a rash). Not only so, but quite early in the book we

found good reason to distrust Mr. Brockway's memory, history, or judgment. The Sunday before the War of 1914, he was, he tells us, speaking in Great Harwood:

> The crowd was wondering and silent. When the Church services were over the congregations joined the edge of the meeting, a clergyman amongst them. I was bitterly but accurately prophetic. "Comrades", I said, "don't be under any delusions. Your Labour leaders will urge you to fight to save democracy. Your Church leaders will urge you to fight in the name of the Prince of Peace". The clergyman protested, but the following Sunday ministers of religion of all denominations were preaching that the war was a holy crusade.

"Bitter", Mr. Brockway, but not altogether "accurate". We have an idea that even the "clergyman" mentioned did not preach thus either the following Sunday or during the War, and that when the War ended he was, though not accurately, given the credit for securing the return to Parliament of a candidate whose views were not remote from Mr. Brockway's.

Mr. Brockway is no doubt in dead earnest, and nobody doubts his sincerity, or his sympathy with the under-dog. That people who do not share his political views may be equally earnest and sincere rarely seems to occur to him.

The best sections of the book are the prison chapters, where experiences are vividly described and resulting reforms outlined, and Mr. Bernard Shaw's letters. Pp. 167 and 231 need attention. EDITOR.

The Living Thoughts of Saint Paul. Presented by JACQUES MARITAIN. Cassell. 3s. 6d.

We are glad to note this addition to the "Living Thoughts Library" which seeks to provide "the essence of the great works from every age and nation distilled and interpreted by kindred thinkers of our day".

It is somewhat surprising that a Roman Catholic should have been chosen as a "kindred thinker" to St. Paul, for to the piety of the Roman Church the writer of *Galatians* must always be strange and even uncongenial. But if a Roman Catholic thinker was to be chosen to expound "the Living Thoughts" of St. Paul, it was fitting that he should be a Neo-Thomist, for none in the Roman Church are more in sympathy with the teaching of St. Paul than those who attach themselves to the great name of Thomas of Aquinas, and of these there is no more distinguished representative than M. Maritain, to whose wise books many of us are greatly indebted.

Protestant readers will note with interest that *Hebrews* is included in the list of the Epistles of St. Paul and long extracts from it quoted. The extracts from *Acts* and the Epistles are in general those of the Westminster Version, which has neither the advantage of the familiar cadences of the *A.V.* nor the vivid modernity of Moffatt. The book will interest readers of the *Quarterly* not because of any fresh light it sheds on the teaching of Paul, but as showing the possibility within the Roman Church of coming very close to the Pauline doctrine of salvation by faith. Once again we are reminded of that unity in Christian faith which no ecclesiastical divisions can quite obscure. SYDNEY CAVE.

The Common Life in the Body of Christ. By L. S. THORNTON. Dacre Press. 30s.

As long ago as 1928 Fr. Thornton of Mirfield wrote a somewhat notable book on the Incarnation, in which he sought to relate the revelation of God

in Christ to current philosophy. He has now followed it up with a massive work in Biblical theology in which "attention is concentrated largely upon the Church and therefore upon the human aspect of the divine human organism". The book is written quite frankly from the now familiar standpoint of those who emphasize the acts of God in revelation and redemption over against all human judgments and experiences. There is, of course, a false antithesis here, and it is not without its effect on Fr. Thornton's argument.

This is not an easy book to review or indeed to read. It is very learned, very elaborate and detailed, full of good things, and written throughout in a fine Christian spirit. Its exegesis, generally quite sound and suggestive, is sometimes perverse and even fanciful. Its author believes in "the constant submission of theology to the judgment of Scripture", but in actual practice he often obscures the issue by reading into Scriptural terms theological meanings which they will hardly bear. For example, he has much to say about that early Christian fellowship (*koinonia*) from which the Church arose, but he interprets it in the light of the Johannine idea of communion between the Father and the Son, an idea wholly alien to the mind of the early disciples. Fr. Thornton acknowledges the need for criticism of the Scriptures and for recognizing the differences between the individual authors, but he frequently ignores them in practice. He quotes indiscriminately from all the letters of St. Paul, from the Pastorals, and the Johannine books as though they were all on the same level of authority. His conception of the Church too is wholly static and allows no room for development. The Church is the same Church throughout, with Orders, ministry, sacraments, and doctrine all complete. There is no salvation outside the Church, Baptism means regeneration, and in the Eucharist

> we feast upon that glory which by faith we behold. The word became flesh and poured out his blood for us. So the true disciple not only reclines upon Jesus' breast at supper but also eats the flesh and drinks the blood of his Master. The glory incarnate is not only the object of our vision but also the meat and drink of our souls.

This book will delight scholars. It is so full of grist for their mill, so rich in opportunities for controversy and the splitting of hairs. But what about the plain man who, if he were to read it, would assuredly be greatly puzzled and bewildered? Is Christianity really so complicated and intricate a business as this book would make it appear? Fr. Thornton seems to be conscious of the difficulty, for he protests that "naïve and shallow simplicities" have led us nowhere and must give place to the true simplicity which is "profound and mysterious"—in other words not simple at all. When the plain man asked the apostles, "What must I do to be saved?" he received a comparatively simple answer. There is a simplicity toward Christ which no theological subtleties or institutional intricacies should be allowed to obscure.

W. B. Selbie.

God and Evil. By C. E. M. Joad. Faber. 8s. 6d.

Is Joad also among the prophets? It would indeed appear so from this most interesting book. Its author has been greatly impressed by the new obtrusiveness of evil caused by the war and the apparent breakdown of civilization. He feels that

> evil today so invades the consciousness that one cannot, with the best will in the world, ignore it and paradoxically it brings not so much a belief in God as the need to believe.

It is this felt need that has led Dr. Joad to review the whole theistic prob-

lem again from a new angle; in doing so he is at once ruthlessly thorough and entirely frank. There is a vein of personal confession running through the whole book which greatly adds to its attractiveness, giving pungency to its criticisms and a practical value to its conclusions. It must not be supposed, however, that Dr. Joad has become or is in the way of becoming a Christian. He is still extremely critical of the whole Christian position and outlook. But he has certainly abandoned that very negative agnosticism which has marked his attitude so far, and by confessing his need for God has at least opened the way for belief in a God who can supply the need.

The book covers a great deal of ground and is written with all the writer's accustomed confidence and verve. If the tone sometimes savours of omniscience and the judgments appear to be hasty, it all adds to the reader's interest and stimulates him to think for himself. Here then is some of the food for thought which Dr. Joad supplies. Matter is not the only form of reality. Life, mind, and values are equally real and not mere by-products of matter. No logical process can give us a Creator God who is at once omnipotent and benevolent. But there are other ways of reaching that goal. Moral values at least point in the direction of a personal God who has knowledge of and interest in this world. It is reasonable to suppose that such a God would seek to make himself known to and through specially gifted individuals. Hence the vogue of religious experience:

> In the last resort it is experience and only experience that can certify the so-called truths of religion, and of relevant experiences the most direct and well authenticated examples are the experiences of the mystics.

Evil is not created by God, nor is it only the outcome of man's abuse of his freedom. But there is a principle of evil in the universe probably independent of God. If the religious view of life as meaningful and purposive be true then this life is not all, "and something probably survives the break-up of our bodies". All these conclusions, though tentative and provisional, do definitely point towards a religious view of life and of the world. Hence, says Dr. Joad,

> it follows that I am willing, as I once was not, to bank on the religious hypothesis being true. This is not mere pragmatism, since one of my conclusions is that man's desire for and disposition to accept the religious hypothesis is, because of its universality, evidence in favour of the hypothesis.

The attack on Christianity with which the book concludes will alienate many. Here Dr. Joad protests too much and goes out of his way to be unpleasant. We all know that popular Christianity carries a good deal of top-hamper that needs to be thrown overboard. But the great central truths of our religion have been well tested in the crucible of experience and are not easily shaken.

W. B. Selbie.

The People and the Presence. A Study of the Atonement. By W. J. Phythian-Adams, D.S.O., M.C., D.D. Oxford Press. 12s. 6d.

Canon Phythian-Adams has written a very fresh and interesting book, which may be summed up as a renewal of the Greek patristic doctrine of the Atonement on the basis of Otto's philosophy and its application to the *Old Testament*. In his famous work, *Das Heilige* (E.T., *The Idea of the Holy*), Otto developed the notion of the "numinous" as the fundamental point in the conception of God. He defined it as the "altogether other", and as the "awful yet fascinating mystery"; and he opposed this aspect of the Divine to its rational and ethical aspect, asserting its supremacy over all

that is rational in our idea of Deity. Canon Phythian-Adams accepts this position and works out its consequences: firstly, for *O.T.* study, and, secondly, for the doctrine of the Atonement.

In the study of the *O.T.* the result is a reversal of the modern preference of the prophetic to the priestly element. The priestly system is based on the recognition of the numinous; and is intended to bridge the gulf between man and God's awful holiness. The prophetic emphasis on righteousness is in no way opposed to the priestly basis of Israelite religion, but simply expresses the conditions on which the presence of God among His people can avail for their good. Not Jeremiah, but Ezekiel, is the supreme *O.T.* prophet: in Ezekiel's combination of moral emphasis with regard for ritual we have the high point of Hebrew religion.

The application of Otto's philosophy to the doctrine of the Atonement follows a similar line of thought. In the Atonement the Divine takes precedence over the human. The fundamental work of Christ is seen in His Death and Resurrection, which were, as St. Paul teaches, the death and resurrection also of the Christian. Canon Phythian-Adams therefore speaks of Christ's work as the "Incorporation", *i.e.*, the establishment of the Church as the body of Christ: it was in fact the constitution of a new life in humanity, freed from sin, and united to God. It is, in a word, by the Presence of God in Christ the Head, and in the members of His Body, that there is salvation. The reverse side of the "Incorporation" of Christ is our sacramental incorporation in Him. Incorporation is what is primary in Christianity, its ethical aspect is secondary. Thus the Greek patristic doctrine of the Atonement comes into its own once more.

The People and the Presence is yet another sign of the present theological reaction from the liberalism of the last generation. If the premiss of the supremacy of the numinous over the ethical is once accepted, the argument from that basis must be judged coherent and excellent; but those who entirely reject the premiss, as does the reviewer, will continue to prefer Jeremiah to Ezekiel and Abelard's doctrine of the Atonement to that of the Greek Fathers.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Doctrine of Our Redemption. By NATHANIEL MICKLEM, D.D. Eyre & Spottiswoode. 4s. 6d.

Principal Micklem has accepted an invitation from the Archbishop of Canterbury to write his Lent book for 1943: he says that, while he was astonished at the choice, it serves as a happy reminder that in spite of differences of Church order there is no controversy between the Church of England and Orthodox Dissent in matters of faith. Here a caveat is necessary. No doubt what Dr. Micklem mainly has in mind is that Orthodox Dissent, whether credal or non-credal, has constantly held by the Catholic doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation. But it would be very difficult to find any support in Orthodox Dissent for the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, which is plainly taught in the Anglican Prayer-Book. The statement, therefore, requires some limitation: it must be taken, shall we say, *cum grano salis*.

The title of Dr. Micklem's contribution sufficiently states its subject, but not its peculiar scope and method. He himself defines this in his Preface, as follows:—

> This is not another text-book dealing historically with the various doctrines of the Atonement. Still less does it offer some novel doctrine of my own. Nor on the other hand, does it belong to the class of edifying literature addressed rather to the heart and the feelings than

to the head. It is written to stimulate thought and thereby, please God, quicken devotion also.

Now this is an enterprise in which it would have been fatally easy to fall between two stools and satisfy neither part of the aim. But it may be said at once that Dr. Micklem has succeeded admirably in a task for which his combination of theological insight with literary talent specially qualifies him. His illustrations of the subject from the literature of devotion are excellently chosen and are catholic in the best sense of the word. Also the historical work which forms the framework of the book is both sound and good, except only that St. Anselm should not be included among the theologians who held that "in the end that whatever God wills is just": Anselm maintained that one who willed what was not just could not be God.

Dr. Micklem's theological attitude is irenic. He has given a sympathetic account of the different stages of the doctrine of Redemption from its Biblical origins down to the Reformation. He is singularly fair all round: he seeks to see the truth in all forms of Christian thought and to modernize them without giving away anything essential. The one criticism that I have to make of his theological work is that I think he is too fond of solving all difficulties by an appeal to the mystical unity of Christ without and Christ within. It is, he says quite rightly, the same Christ in the Incarnation, in the Church, in the Sacraments, and in the individual Christian. Yes; but surely in very different senses; and, as it has been well said, Distinction is the first point of logic. But I do not wish to end on the note of criticism. Dr. Micklem has written a very beautiful book.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Forgiveness of Sins. By CHARLES WILLIAMS. The Centenary Press. 3s. 6d.

The publishers describe this book as an attempt to treat its great subject imaginatively as well as intellectually. Such an attempt is praiseworthy, but it has resulted in the production of a very strange piece of literature, in which a theological outline, based mainly upon Aquinas, is embroidered with what may fitly be called arabesques and sometimes even with grotesques; like many modern writers, Mr. Williams seems compelled at times to drag in the generative functions in an unnecessary way. But, apart from this, he roves over a wide field of illustration, drawing upon Shakespeare, Dante, Milton, Blake, William Law, and the Lady Julian of Norwich. At times he says some very striking things. He is at his best when he leaves theology alone, and discusses Shakespeare, or analyzes the nature of human forgiveness. When he is theological, he tends to stretch words beyond their natural meaning, as, for example, when he defines chastity as the relation of the soul to God. Ultra-modern as his book is, it reminds me of nothing so much as a piece of patristic theology. There is the same general waywardness of theological thought, intercalated every now and then with original and valuable ideas.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Pascal's Apology for Religion. By H. F. STEWART. Cambridge Press. 8s. 6d.

It is well known that it was Pascal's intention during the closing years of his life to write an apologetic treatise in defence of his Christian faith. With this in view he had accumulated a good deal of material in the form of scattered thoughts and arguments, which he had set down anyhow, just

as they had occurred to him. The systematic working up of this material, however, was prevented by his death in August, 1662. Hence the famous *Pensées* have remained as they were written, disconnected, and yet affording stimulating and helpful ideas to those in search of religious truth.

The general lines on which Pascal intended to present his material as an ordered and systematic whole had been indicated in a lecture delivered at Port Royal a few years before his death. Nevertheless, his friends preferred to publish the fragments more or less as they stood, and subsequent editors, until recently, have been chary of venturing upon a radical reconstruction.

Professor Stewart tells us that he has long been desirous of seeing a volume which should incorporate most of Pascal's material arranged in accordance with the plan sketched out in his Port Royal Lecture. Finding nothing as yet quite satisfactory, he essayed the task himself, and has thereby laid all students of Pascal under an obligation of gratitude. We have now in French a complete *Apology* as Pascal himself might have composed it. Some of the more intimate passages have been omitted, and these Prof. Stewart hopes to present in a second volume of *Pascalia*. We may congratulate him on attaining his object in this volume, which, in his own words,

> is to present in a reasonably coherent form material which, even in its broken state and despite the obvious desuetude of some of its arguments, is a very present help for all who seek to champion the Christian faith.

E. J. Price.

SHORTER NOTICES & DESCRIPTIVE LIST

(*Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.*)

A new volume of "The Speaker's Bible" (Aberdeen, 10s. 6d.)—*The Pastoral and Johannine Epistles*—leaves us once more in admiration of the Editor's skill, first in "roping in" competent assistants to write the introductions, and second, in seizing on illustrative material, some of it issued only yesterday: thus while we have Drummond and Moody and Spurgeon, we have also H. H. Farmer and W. E. Sangster and Kagawa.

Readers of these pages know well that the Rev. Gwilym O. Griffith is blessed with a keen mind and an arresting style, and they will open his exposition of *Galatians—Racialism and World Faith* (Lutterworth Press, 6s.) —with eager anticipation. They will not be disappointed, for to his own perspicacious comment Mr. Griffith adds many a beam of light from Bible translators, ancient and modern, and from commentators from Chrysostom and Luther to Barth and Brunner: the result is a study of the Epistle which preachers will greatly value. We are warned at the beginning that Barth and Kierkegaard have had their influence on the writer's thinking; so they have, and we cannot but feel that in his reaction from liberalism, humanism, and progress, Mr. Griffith has swung too far. After all, sin is not the main fact in life, but the grace of God, the truth that where sin abounded grace can much more abound. The Gospel is given, but there must be man to receive; sinning man is not so separated from God that he cannot receive; and he can not only receive but become a saint. "Now are ye sons of God"; "The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth and in thine heart": not easy for the Barthian to explain, but an essential part of the Christian faith.

Mr. Griffith makes the Epistle live; indeed we shall from now on associate him with exclamation marks! But perhaps it is Paul who should be

so associated; certainly their use succeeds in conveying the Apostle's earnestness, explosiveness, energy. With such an admirable selection of quotations, it is a pity the Index is incomplete; had it been thorough, we suspect that the Wheeler who does not appear in it (p. 17) would have become Wheeler Robinson, whom we will quote as an antidote to Mr. Griffith: "It is noteworthy that Jesus never mentions the fall of man, nor is there any very conclusive passage in which He speaks of man as a sinner".

A *Festschrift* is always the despair of a reviewer with limited space, for he can never do justice to all its contributors. Principal Wheeler Robinson well deserves the honour of a volume of this kind which the Rev. E. A. Payne has edited under the title *Studies in History and Religion* (Lutterworth Press, 21s.). Mr. Payne himself contributes a bibliography and an interesting essay (pp. 231 and 240 need attention) on Nonconformist Theological Education. Altogether there are fourteen essayists, all but the Rev. A. J. D. Farrer, for 20 years Dr. Wheeler Robinson's colleague, the Principal's former students at Rawdon or Regent's Park. Of the 14, nine are engaged in teaching in Colleges or Universities, four are ministers, and one Home Secretary of the B.M.S. This fact is in itself a great tribute to Dr. Wheeler Robinson. We do not particularize in regard to the articles, but merely say the volume deserves the attention of our readers.

In *The Holy Communion* (Longmans, 2s. 6d.), the Bishop of London's Lent Book, Canon Spencer Leeson has written a devotional study which many Christians will find very helpful. The unbeliever, we fear, will scarcely be influenced by it, but those who share the writer's convictions and experience will be grateful for it. It is passing strange that Canon Leeson, who writes an eirenical Preface proclaiming his intention to be anything but controversial, begins his first two chapters by so defiantly trailing his coat. "There are seven sacraments"—but many in Canon Leeson's Church hold that there are only two, and other Christians believe that there are seventy times seven, or that all life is sacramental. Was this red rag really necessary? And next: "Alone among all the services in our liturgy, the Holy Communion was instituted by Our (that unhappy capital for our weak and sinful selves again) Lord Himself". But many Christians, including some of the best *N.T.* scholars, do not believe in the dominical institution. We do not want to cavil, but surely in his own interests Canon Leeson would have been well advised to begin his chapters with sentences more in the spirit of the whole book, sentences which would encourage inquirers neither to stop reading nor to argue, but to read on.

Dr. N. Micklem, who introduces Principal W. Robinson's *A Companion to the Communion Service* (Oxford Press, 2s. 6d.), finds it "hard to divine and painful to recall" the reasons for "the depreciation and neglect of the sacraments in most of the Free Churches". Some of them can be discovered even in Principal Robinson's pages: the scent of superstition hangs about "[The elements] should then be discreetly and reverently removed to the vestry and such bread and wine as remain reverently consumed there". With all the repetition of the phrase "the Reformed tradition", there is no emphasis on the fact that the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacrament were invariably joined together (Dr. Robinson gives 5 lines to the Sermon, 23 to the Offertory). There is a tendencious selection of passages from "Reformed divines", and this remarkable opening dictum, "The Service of Holy Communion is the Lord's own Service, instituted by Him", again without the slightest suggestion of the doubts of *N.T.* scholars. It is a pity Dr. Robinson has not made his brochure the

"Devotional Manual" it presumes to be. There is much that is helpful and beautiful in the prayers and selection of readings.

Dr. H. P. Van Dusen's *What is the Church Doing?* (S.C.M., 5s.) seemed to us to begin badly, to taper off at the end, and to be excellent in the middle, where much useful information is given. Dr. Van Dusen summarizes what is being done by "The Churches in Captivity", the Younger Christian Churches, and "The World Church", and then discusses the outlook for "World Christianity Tomorrow". Handy and useful.

In **The Army Chaplain* (Black, 3s.) the D.C.G., the Rev. P. Middleton Brumwell, has written a very timely book, which not only outlines the chaplain's status, his duties, and his opportunities, but also gives a succinct history of the Royal Army Chaplains' Department. As we read we could not help contrasting the United States system with our own. There chaplains are appointed not in proportion to the individual denominational registrations, but in proportion to national denominational statistics, and, once appointed, the chaplain serves men of all denominations in the regiment or section to which he is posted. It would be valuable to learn from the experience of the two Armies which method gives the best results.

We are grateful to Miss Lily H. Montagu for the intimate picture of her own life she has given us in **The Faith of a Jewish Woman* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.). Born in a pious and orthodox Jewish home, Miss Montagu gradually awoke to the need for a progressive faith, and, at the cost of much pain to her family and herself, became one of the founders of Liberal Judaism. With Claude Montefiore and Rabbi Mattuck she has played a great part in this movement. Her work for it and in various forms of social service are described in this very readable book. And here is a challenge for Christians:

> We all know Christians who lead as high a life as any Jew of our acquaintance; but we should be insincere if, while proclaiming our faith in the Unity of God, we did not at the same time affirm that the man who believes wholeheartedly in the One and Only God to whom he is directly responsible for the conduct of his life has a better incentive to righteousness than he who believes himself redeemed by the Christ who gave his life to atone for the sins of the world.

Professor Hugh Watt's *Thomas Chalmers and the Disruption* (Nelson, 12s. 6d.) tells the familiar story in a way that once again stirs the blood—even while it teaches us a good many new words. Written with amazing freshness, it makes the ten years' conflict very real, and reveals the greatness of the leader of those who "came out".

Mr. Percy Colson calls *The Future of Faith* (Hurst & Blackett, 6s.), of which he is the editor, "A Diversity of Views". That description is far too limited to describe the articles, impressions, interviews, comments—on religion, education, science, art, the Jews, Boy Scouts, re-incarnation, spiritualism, business—which make up the book. Of course, with contributors (though sometimes that is not the proper term) such as the Dean of St. Paul's and Mr. Christopher Dawson there is much that is worth reading, and the opinions of two headmasters are suggestive, but the reader knows as little of the future of faith at the end as he did at the beginning. The liveliest article is Lord Vansittart's Preface, in which he castigates, and not undeservedly, two clerical contributors, the Revs. Eric Loveday and Leslie Weatherhead.

The Rev. R. G. Martin has edited *Talking Things Over* (R.E.P., 3s. 6d.), which all leaders of youth groups will find helpful and suggestive.

Several writers have combined to outline questions of belief and conduct frequent in the thought of young people: we have *The Question Stated, The Question Explored,* and *The Question Discussed.* The Appendix on Books, Stories, and Plays adds to the value of the book. The spelling of Moffatt is not uniform, and Glynn on p. 129 should be Glenn.

We are glad the S.C.M. has published a 1943 edition of *A Christian Year Book* (2s. 6d.), which contains information about ecumenical Christianity nowhere else obtainable in such handy form. It is a pity that the unsatisfactory Table of Divisions within the Church has been reproduced, and the article "Congregationalists" is tendencious rather than objective. That is a criticism, however, which can be brought, and not without reason, against the handbook as a whole: it is specially noticeable in the allocation of space: "The Historic Eastern Churches" get 12 pp., the Friends 1 p., and the Methodist and Baptist Churches of the U.S. perhaps half-a-page between them. The edition contains much new matter, and should be part of the equipment of every church.

With his usual aptness in summing up a situation, Baden-Powell said he had lived two lives, the first as a soldier, the second in Scoutdom. They are both admirably described in Mr. E. E. Reynolds's excellent biography, **Baden-Powell* (Oxford Press, 12s. 6d.), which will no doubt be read by thousands who feel themselves indebted to the founder of the Boy Scout movement. Baden-Powell's gifts with pen and pencil are frequently used by Mr. Reynolds, and the result is a book which remains alive even when it passes from active life in India and Africa to the organization of a movement destined to spread all over the world. As we read the account of B.-P.'s great achievement we cannot help wondering what the future has in store for it. Will the Hitler Youth and similar organizations in totalitarian countries affiliate with it after the War, and so make it truly international? Perhaps the history of the world will be affected by the answer. In days when the outlook for all "Youth Movements" is not clear, ministers and all leaders of youth would do well to read this biography.

It is indeed strange that no adequate biography has been written of Jean Jaurès, perhaps the most remarkable Frenchman of our time. Had he not been assassinated in 1914 the first World War would have taken a very different course, and, had there been a second, the part France played in it would have been far other than that we have known—Jaurès's plan for Army reform, to say nothing of his political convictions, would have seen to that. Jaurès was a historian of the first class—Dr. G. P. Gooch's recent reference to his "great history of the French Revolution" is quoted —and in addition he had a remarkable prescience: it is almost uncanny to see how he forecasts events of the last three years. Too sagacious to be a safe party man, and perhaps too trustful to be a successful politician, he won the respect of those who differed from him. International Socialism has sorely lacked a man of his background and calibre. Mr. J. Hampden Jackson's *Jean Jaurès* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.) is an extremely well-written and well-balanced account of a man whose life and work have been too soon forgotten.

It is a pity Mrs. Howell did not print her memoir of her husband, *Philip Howell* (Allen & Unwin, 15s.), years ago when it was written. General Howell was killed in France in 1916 at the age of 38, having already won the reputation of a fine and fearless soldier. Even the warfare of the present day does not obscure the interest of Howell's letters written from France and Salonika. He was a soldier who hated war, whose soul re-

volted at its waste: had he lived, many lives might have been saved, for he was economical in the use of his men, and Douglas Haig was prepared to listen to him as he listened to few. Howell had been *Times* Correspondent in the Balkans, and he knew too much for an Army Chief of Staff. He was held to have interfered in matters beyond his province and was brought home from Salonika. He had all the soldier's impatience of politicians, but on the whole history has shown him to be right in his convictions: Lord Robert Cecil said of him, "A very remarkable personality, and quite a lot of brains for a soldier". Mrs. Howell does not conceal the happiness of her married life: her son was born after his father's death.

Mr. G. M. Ll. Davies's *Joseph Rowntree Gillett* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) is a memoir of an attractive Quaker (1874-1940) who relinquished his profession of banker to give himself to religious work. Adult education, sexual hygiene, peace, and unemployment were Gillett's main concerns: the volume contains extracts from travel letters, specimen articles, and two misprints (pp. 41 and 126).

Prof. Eugene Tarlé's *Napoleon's Invasion of Russia, 1812* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.) has been excellently translated by G.M., though one or two "obligateds" and "buck the current" are revealing. This dramatic story will stand many tellings, though whether any of them will have any effect on Hitler may be doubted: if he had read this harrowing story of the retreat even he might have paused. The parallel between 1812 and 1941 is always in the reader's mind: Hitler seems to be as prodigal in the lives of non-Germans as Napoleon was of those of non-Frenchmen—he boasted that the campaign cost only 50,000 "real Frenchmen"; the stubborn resistance and dauntless courage of the Russian people shine out in both centuries. Borodino, bloodiest of battles, destroyed any chance of victory Napoleon might have had. There will always be debate whether Kutuzov could have captured or destroyed Napoleon and saved Europe three years of war; Prof. Tarlé champions the Marshal's cause, and clearly believes him right in his determination to save *Russia,* and with the loss of as few lives as possible.

Wiseman is the hero of Mr. Denis Gwynn's *The Second Spring* (Burns, Oates, 9s.), which describes the Catholic revival in England from 1818 to the restoration of the hierarchy. They were eventful years, and perhaps the majority of English readers will learn most, not from the pages about distinguished figures like Newman, but from the account of the work of George Spencer, Ambrose Phillipps, Barberi, and Gentili. Mr. Gwynn tells the story well, and his book is very readable, though occasionally he gets badly entangled in his pronouns.

The Rev. J. G. Patton has written a very readable account of the history of Newland Church, Hull, where he was minister for thirty years. *The Story of Hope Street Newland Congregational Church* (Brown, 3s.) goes back to 1797.

No one more fitted than Dr. Ernest Barker could have been found to write *Britain and the British People* in "The World Today" series (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.). Whether he turns to Parliament or Government, Law or Education, he writes with equal authority, and the chapter on "Religion and the Churches" is fine and fair, with full recognition of the contribution the Free Churches have made to the country and to mankind.

Mr. A. S. G. Butler's *Recording Ruin* (Constable, 7s. 6d.) is the slightly snobby but nevertheless readable account of the work of an architect whose duty it was to survey bombed property in London. The description of this

work—especially the poignant account of the picture-framer who had just lost his wife—is not more interesting than the long digression on Lord Curzon or the story of fire-fighting in St. Paul's Cathedral. Mr. Butler says his experiences may have affected his style; we agree, and wish that Mr. Michael Sadleir had "vetted" as well as introduced his friend's book: sometimes sentences baffle us or seem to say the opposite of what they mean —as, *e.g.*,

> I hope therefore that . . . or that there will be many nights like last Wednesday quite yet.

With memories of two very good books on journalism in mind, we opened Mr. Harold Herd's *Panorama, 1900-1942* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) with pleasurable anticipations. These were not disappointed, for Mr. Herd has given us another readable book. From his boyhood in Skipton, through Edwardian days and the last war, Mr. Herd passes through the "False Dawn" between the Wars, down to Munich and the bombing of London. Graphic and sensible, with an eye for the salient points, these pages are well worth reading.

Mr. S. L. Bethell may not be a superior person, but *The Literary Outlook* (Sheldon Press, 2s. 6d.) reads as if he were. Apparently the only chance for a living literature is for writers to accept the particular form of Christianity dear to Mr. T. S. Eliot, and, presumably, to Mr. S. L. Bethell as well. A modern Shakespeare, Milton, and Shelley—if any such should appear—would be among the "Also Rans". This is a "*Christian News-Letter* Book". Why?

Mr. Janko Lavrin's *Dostoevky* (Methuen, 7s. 6d.) is a very able and well written critical study. Mr. Lavrin has wisely kept his book within essay limits: he wastes no words, and there is no padding. As an introduction to Dostoevsky the book will be hard to beat.

Mr. S. F. Markham's fascinating essay, *Climate and the Energy of Nations* (Oxford Press, 10s. 6d.), had its origin in a remark of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, to whom he was Parliamentary Secretary: speaking in 1931, the Prime Minister said, "Government has become no more than an ambulance, and its success is measured by the speed with which it deals with disaster". Mr. Markham began to examine the causes of national greatness or of great civilizations, and he came to the conclusion that climate was the most important factor. A temperature between 60° and 76°, with humidity from 40 per cent to 70 per cent, is the desideratum, and it is round about the 70° isotherm that the most energetic groups have clustered. The most important question, therefore, is how to control climate, so that conditions approximating to the ideal can be secured. The use of coal for heating houses, and of wool for clothing, played a great part in Britain's supremacy. Mr. Markham discusses death-rates and foreign trade as indications of national energy, and glances at the Jews and the "poor whites" as illustrative of his thesis. An interesting and important study.

Dr. O. Lechner's *As We Saw It In Prague* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) brought back all the shame we felt at Munich time. It is to be regretted that he was not content to tell the story—from 1933 to 1939—in a simple, straightforward narrative; instead he throws it into the form of conversations between two bank officials and a civil servant. Assuredly never men spake like these three; but even their stilted sentences do not hide the tragedy or expunge the shame.

Mr. Bernhard Menne is a German journalist who has been both Communist and Socialist. *The Case of Dr. Bruening* (Hutchinson, 1s.) is a violent attack on the German Catholic Ex-Chancellor. Mr. Menne believes that Bruening is no less a villain of the piece than the Nazis, for whom, he holds, the Chancellor paved the way. Now he remains, a silent exile, waiting for his cue:

> during the eight years of his political exile no public word of condemnation has crossed his lips against Adolf Hitler and his crimes of aggression.

Mr. Egon Hostovský's *Letters from Exile* (Allen & Unwin, 4s. 6d.) have been translated from the Czech. They make sombre but salutary reading, and bring home what exile can mean, and what exile can do, to men and women. Mr. Hostovský probes deep, and the result is almost as painful for the onlooker as for the patient: we use the simile advisedly, for it is the pathological effect of exile that is prominently displayed in these eight powerful sketches.

Mr. Alexander Gammie's account of the social work of the Salvation Army, *In Glasgow's Underworld* (Pickering, 2s.), abounds in stories of changes made by the Army in the lives of Glasgow men and women.

The Goebbels Experiment (Murray, 7s. 6d.) ought to be compulsory reading for Members of Parliament and all who influence public opinion. In it Messrs. Derrick Sington and Arthur Weidersfeld describe the "Nazi Propaganda Machine" in a well-documented and careful study. Few people in the democratic countries realize the nature and extent of Nazi propaganda — at home and abroad, through eye and ear, press, radio, cinema, art, music, literature. The description of how the Party trains speakers for audiences large and small is terrifying in itself. We are inclined to believe that mankind will sooner or later kick against all this regimentation and rebel against uniformity, but as yet there seem few signs of rebellion in Germany. The writers of this book have done a real public service.

Mr. Forrest Davis's *The Atlantic System* (Allen & Unwin, 15s.) is an important book which all students of recent history and of post-war politics ought to read. Mahan is his master, and Henry Adams (who coined the phrase Mr. Davis has taken for his title) and Walter Lippmann the men who have best understood and expounded him. Mr. Davis outlines the doctrine of sea power and the relation of Britain and the United States to it from 1894 to 1941. He is critical of Woodrow Wilson for his failure to grasp the idea that united control of the seas by the two countries was the supreme necessity, and he insists that the claim that idealistic motives, and not its own security (the control of the Atlantic), led America into the War of 1914-18 has done much harm. Further, he sees in the Geopolitics of Haushofer, with its World-Island and Heart-land, the rival to the sea-power concept of Mahan—a pincer movement on a global scale. Though once or twice the book becomes journalism, and though Asquith was not Prime Minister of Britain in 1906, the book makes a real contribution to a vital subject.

Mr. Davis ends his survey with the Atlantic Charter, a document which excited interest beyond the area to which its authors probably intended to apply. Indians soon made inquiries about it, and now a very representative American group has published a study of *The Atlantic Charter and Africa from an American Standpoint* (Edinburgh House Press, 4s.), which

all Britishers with economic, political, or religious interests in Africa should ponder. With the aid of Lord Hailey's massive survey and evidence from many with intimate knowledge the American Committee has produced a valuable report which should bring home to white men the significance of the four words which summarize their relation to the vast continent—darkness, misunderstanding, opportunities, responsibilities. A model index.

Much hard thinking is being done in preparation for the post-war world, and the scale and perplexity of the problems facing mankind demand the application of its best brains. Prof. J. B. Condliffe's *Agenda for a Post-War World* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) is an admirable summary of the tasks which will rush upon the governments and peoples of the world when the last shot has been fired. A New Zealander, with long experience on the League of Nations staff, Dr. Condliffe brings no insular mind to the contemplation of his theme, and he writes with a clarity and sincerity that win for him a sympathetic hearing. Much of what he has to say is written specially for the United States—he is now Professor in the University of California—and it is well that "the most powerful community in the modern world" should be reminded, as they are in Dr. Condliffe's final sentence, that "the responsibility of its citizens is an inescapable function of power".

A Permanent United Nations (Putnam, $1.50) is an American lawyer's contribution to the solution of the problem presented by recurring German aggression. Mr. Amos J. Peaslee, the author, believes that we can do better than in 1919, when the American constitutional system was abandoned, and the League was "an institution of diplomats rather than a government of elected representatives and an independent judiciary". The international Society after the war must therefore have a written constitution, with its cornerstones:

> (1) a Bill of Rights declaring and reserving the rights of the people and of the federated states, nations, or other units, and (2) a Judicial System for the protection of those rights.

Thus equipped, the strong democratic United Society of Nations, representing the "honest, friendly, and reasonably intelligent people" who make up 95 per cent of mankind, could control the small minority of "braggarts, bullies, and fiends". The good quality paper, large type, and wide margins of this American book remind us what we are missing.

If Mr. Peaslee thinks Woodrow Wilson was not American enough in his conception of the League, M. Raoul de Roussy de Sales takes the opposite view: his *The Making of Tomorrow* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.) argues that the President

> was profoundly traditional in that he molded his understanding of human history on the pattern of the history of the United States.

There is much that is thought-provoking in M. de Sales's analysis of the concepts of Nationalism, Collectivism, and Pacifism, though some of the chapters rather suggest that they first appeared as magazine articles. Hitler has synthesized apparently irreconcilable concepts—romanticism and machine efficiency. He is not an accident in the evolution of Germany, a gangster, but a legitimate German phenomenon. M. de Sales gives credit to the American foreign correspondents for bringing home to a nation bemused by isolationism for a generation the truth that "Hitlerian Germany is out to overcome what we call civilization and cannot be stopped except by force". A Frenchman who has lived in the United States since 1925, M. de Sales has his nation's clarity—and irony, thus:

> Pétain enjoys the singular distinction among all the rulers that France has known in her long history, of being the first one not to recognize a barbarian when he sees one and the first one to accept the idea that the victor must be right because he has conquered, and the vanquished wrong because he has suffered defeat.

And, after saying that the Nazi persecution of the churches has aroused more resentment in America than in any European country, and in America has shocked the ordinary American more than the churches themselves, he goes on:

> At any rate, this is certainly true as far as the Catholic Church is concerned, whose attitude in the present world conflict has not given the impression that it was blinded by a sense of righteous indignation.

In *A Time for Greatness* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 7s. 6d.) Mr. Herbert Agar often quotes M. de Sales. Mr. Agar has long been one of the most forthright of American publicists, and his scathing views on American fear of propaganda in the early years of the war are reflected in these pages. Some time ago we noted a speech to Canadian Rotarians in which he said he had come from the land of the free to the home of the brave: "As long as you guys go on being brave we shall go on being free". Mr. Agar urges a frank recognition of the issues involved in the war, an abandonment of apathy, complacency, and selfish and sectional aims, and a resolve to fight for the President's four freedoms for all men. "Semon" on p. 74 needs first aid.

Kegan Paul's "International Library of Sociology and Social Reconstruction" gives promise of great usefulness. Its editor, Dr. Karl Mannheim, has an unusual grip of sociological problems, even if sometimes words seem to run away with him. His **Diagnosis of Our Times* (10s. 6d.) is one of the most stimulating of recent books, and it should be read by all churchmen, for some of its essays directly concern them, especially the "challenge to Christian thinkers" called "Towards a New Social Philosophy". A good deal of the book deals with youth; and, strangely enough, we find Dr. Mannheim least convincing when he touches education. Dr. Mannheim believes in "planning for freedom", and in this volume he relates his conception of future developments to the Church: in so doing subjects like asceticism, the place of privacy in the modern world, and the adjustments Catholicism and Protestantism need to make, come under review. See "Worth Noting" in our next issue.

Authors must sometimes pray to be delivered from their publishers. The jacket of Mr. Christopher Dawson's *The Judgement of the Nations* (Sheed & Ward, 8s. 6d.) proclaims: "As an historical philosopher, Mr. Christopher Dawson stands alone in the modern world". A stranger to Mr. Dawson's writings, reading the book on the strength of this testimonial, would, we cannot but think, be profoundly disappointed. Those who do know them will find what they expect, an acute mind at work on some of the most vital concerns of our time. Mr. Dawson is concerned in this work to forward "The Sword of the Spirit Movement". Believing that the disunion of Christendom is largely responsible for the secularization of Western culture, and for the state of the world today, he desires a return to Christian unity, which may grow out of common social action. The idea of the Roman Catholic Church as an advocate of religious freedom is one to which it is difficult to get accustomed, and we see little in this book of disapproval of or contrition for that Church's record of persecution. Mr. Dawson says that "to the average Englishman the typical Catholic was not

Thomas More but Guy Fawkes''; that is an exaggeration, but it must be remembered that the average Englishman remembered Smithfield, and St. Bartholomew's day, 1572, and that Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* had been for years part of his staple diet. When that has been said, we gladly recognize the new spirit in these pages; such a book from a Roman Catholic would have been impossible a generation ago.

New life would be brought to many church meetings were they to discuss the questions at the end of Dr. T. G. Dunning's *Settlement with Germany* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.). They cover a wide field, both in estimating the past and surveying the future. Perhaps Dr. Dunning's most effective points are his pleas that the Church's teaching should be ''relevant'', and that personal contacts after the war will be of supreme importance.

The enthusiasm with which Dr. Joseph Needham fights against the isolation of science from life and letters is highly to be praised. He takes the title of his book of essays, *Time: the Refreshing River* (Allen & Unwin, 16s.), from W. H. Auden, and that fact illustrates his approach to the varied problems with which he deals. Dr. Needham has read widely and writes in a lively fashion, but when Marx and Engels and dialectical materialism are like a King Charles's head, we begin to long for the objectivity of the scientist. And, spreading himself over so wide a field, he is often on ground that he has only scratched; his authority on the Kingdom of God is a book written in 1901; what would Dr. Needham have said if a theologian had written of biochemistry as if the last word had been said forty years ago? And was any theologian more dogmatic than this scientist? The rehabilitation of Henry Drummond's *Natural Law in the Spiritual World* is surprising, and so is ''exsuccous'', which we suspect will drive most readers to their dictionaries. We have enjoyed reading a book which we approached with fear and trembling; Dr. Needham has moved considerably, and he will move still further when his obsession with economics vanishes and he sees things in proportion: the Levellers were not *really* the most important people in Commonwealth Britain!

Mr. G. D. H. Cole always writes interestingly, though in *Great Britain in the Post-War World* (Gollancz, 6s.) he seems ready to admit that he is writing too much. It is good to have within the Labour Party an ''intellectual'' with convictions of his own and not afraid to express them. Mr. Cole is critical of that Party as of all others, and he is not prepared to support a Communist Party which is an unintelligent copy of Soviet Russia and unready to relate its policy to the British situation. In this volume Mr. Cole surveys the post-war situation of Britain — economic, social, political. He shows how and where Britain is undemocratic—he refuses to identify democracy with parliamentary government, and holds that fundamentally the Soviet system is more truly democratic—and is specially severe on the public schools. There are few post-war problems on which he does not touch, and always suggestively, though he will please neither socialists nor individualists. And the outcome? It depends on the emergence of small groups:

> We have to return to an elementary faith in the value of intelligent argument and the power of fellowship—the ''when two or three are gathered together'' of the Christian faith, before it became lost in the trappings of ecclesiastical pretension.

The Rev. F. H. Ballard's *The Churches Face the Challenge* (Nisbet, 2s. 6d.) is a thoughtful and helpful ''examination of the five standards added by British Religious Leaders to the Pope's 'Five Points' ''.

The Archbishop of Canterbury introduces *Towards a Christian Order* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 9s.), a volume of essays based on the Malvern Report, which is well worth attention. Among the most notable contributions are Canon Marriott's "The Soul of Man", the Bishop of Chelmsford's "The Family and the Home", and the Headmaster of Rugby's "Religion in the School". The Rev. F. C. Pond's "Equality of Educational Opportunity" lacks realism, and the Rev. W. G. Peck loses the reader, if not himself, in "Man and Money". Finally, under "What Shall the New Order Be?", Sir Richard Acland argues for Common Ownership, Miss Ruth Kenyon for "Christian Corporations" (otherwise Guilds), and Mr. Sidney Dark for Socialism.

We welcome Mr. James Hardyman into the ranks of authors. Brought up in Madagascar, he has written an excellent summary of life on the island, history and geography forming the background for vivid pictures of missionary activity. *Eyes on Madagascar* (Livingstone Press, 1s.).

The townsman whose occupation is sedentary will find joy and peace in Mr. C. F. Tunnicliffe's *My Country Book* (The Studio, 15s.). If, like ourselves, he possesses no gifts at all in his fingers, he will marvel at the skill with which Mr. Tunnicliffe draws birds and beasts, houses and trees. From the Cheshire farm where he worked as a lad, Mr. Tunnicliffe takes us with him to many parts of England, Scotland, and Wales on his bird-drawing expeditions, and the result is a delightful volume. Some of the full-paged coloured drawings are very beautiful; when all are good it is difficult to choose those outstanding; we liked "Pigs Asleep", "Eyas Tiercel", "Gawsworth Old Hall and Pool", and "Study of a Turnip Top", a selection which has the advantage of indicating the variety to be found in the book. We must express gratitude to Mr. Tunnicliffe for bringing the country into the city, and pleasant peace into sombre winter war-time days.

Mr. Eric Partridge has given us another useful book. Those who come into contact with the Army in these days will be especially grateful for *A Dictionary of Abbreviations* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.). So far as we have been able to test it, it is full, reliable, and at times amusing.

Mr. P. W. Petter's *Guilty Clergy* (W. H. Smith, 1s. 6d.) is an attack on Anglo-Catholics. It urges an Act of Parliament "To Arrest Lawlessness in the Church of England", by which all clergy employing named acts and practices shall be brought before Courts of Summary Jurisdiction.

Those who like collections of stories will find many old ones—and a few new—in Mr. Bennet Finck's *The Curate's Egg* (Laurie, 3s. 6d.), "a book of anecdotes chiefly clerical". The collection is commended by Mr. Sidney Dark, whose misspelling of names has now reached such lengths that he even spells Canon Mackay's name wrongly.

We are sorry that Mr. H. I'Anson Fausset has left criticism, a field where he has made particularly fine contributions, for fiction. *Between the Tides* (Heffer, 8s. 6d.) proves that fiction is *not* his medium; while he could not write uninterestingly, and while his treatment of a fundamental problem is suggestive, his story scarcely deserves the description "summer idyll", and the strings pulling the characters are often very obvious.

EDITOR.

Mr. A. R. Johnson's *The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God* (University of Wales Press, 2s.) is a careful linguistic study of Hebraic mentality starting from the oscillation between the individual and the "corporate personality" of the group, and considering in the light of this the relation of Yahweh to the Spirit, the Ark, the Elohim, the Angels,

and the Prophet. It is exact, competent, documented. Its presuppositions are, however, strictly psychological-historical, untouched by the deeper religious-theological exegesis exemplified by Kittel's *Theological Dictionary*, and this limits the value of the paper.

H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

John Morgan Jones (of Merthyr Tydfil), who died in 1935, published in Welsh some lectures on the *O.T.* which had been given to W.E.A. classes. These are now translated and republished under the title, *The Revelation of God in the Old Testament* (Clarke, 6s.). Naturally, they follow familiar lines in tracing the development of the Israelite idea of God. Their distinctive feature is a certain freshness in dealing with the material, which is evidently the result of independent thinking and real appreciation of the religious values underlying the history. Consequently, the book is suggestive and readable, in spite of its well-worn theme. Most people would find something in it to stimulate their own thought.

Mrs. Jeannie B. Thomson Davies's *Heralds of God* (S.C.M., 5s.) is a simple account of the prophets of Israel in narrative form for school use. The view-point is that of modern scholarship and the material is handled in competent fashion. The scope is from Moses to John the Baptist. The book is well fitted for its particular purpose.

Mr. Jeremiah ben-Jacob's *The Jewish Struggle* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) is a collection of recent lectures on the past, present, and future fortunes of the Jews. Its unifying theme is "Zionism", in the particular form that the author rejects all solutions of the Jewish problem other than the establishment of an independent Jewish state in Palestine. With this end in view, he appeals for British and American support in the (negotiated) removal of all Arabs from Palestine to Irak. The argument is plausibly and vigorously put, but can hardly be said to do justice to the Arab point of view. The book contains a good deal of interesting information, *e.g.*, as to the circumstances leading towards the concentration of the Jews in Eastern Europe, and the various attempts to find a Jewish territory other than Palestine. But the practical usefulness of this information is much diminished by the unpardonable absence of any index, and by the slightness of the literary documentation. The book also suffers, like so much Jewish writing, by lack of structure and frequent repetition, which makes it rather irritating to a logically minded reader.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

Mr. E. H. Blakeney, of Winchester College, has given us through the S.P.C.K. an edition of the Greek text, with introduction and notes, of the second-century *Epistle to Diognetus* (6s.). This short and beautiful early Christian apology is usually included with the "Apostolic Fathers"; and most editions and translations of it are accessible only as items in that collection. I am not acquainted with any other English commentary on the Greek text. Although there exists already an S.P.C.K. translation of the document by Dr. L. B. Radford, it seems rather a pity that an English version could not have been included in this handy little volume—as also that the last two chapters, though admittedly no part of the letter itself, are altogether omitted. However, we must be grateful for what *is* provided —the succinct introduction, the clearly-printed text, the full and very admirable notes, and the excursus on daemons and idol-worship. It is to be hoped that the publication will stimulate the study of this attractive piece of early Christian writing. Dr. H. G. Meecham's article in the January issue of *The Expository Times*, on the *theology* of the epistle, will provide a useful supplement.

C. J. CADOUX.

As a contribution to the study of sociology, *Society Natural and Divine*, by the Rev. A. P. Carleton (S.P.C.K., 6s.), leaves a good deal to be desired. It makes no pretence to be a scientific treatment of the subject, but deals with one aspect of it only, *viz.*, the impact of the Church on human society. Mr. Carleton is a convinced Anglo-Catholic and is chiefly concerned to vindicate the claim of the Church to be a truly divine society with a truly apostolic mission and ministry. The mission of Israel, the coming of the Messiah, and the founding of the apostolic society are themes which occupy the larger half of his book, and are discussed from the standpoint of one who, from the outset, assumes "the Catholic position". The Church has three duties towards natural society, intercession, witness, and the quest of social justice. But the Church is hindered in the good work by her lack of unity. Mr. Carleton has been a missionary in India and sees the problem of reunion from the missionary standpoint. But that does not prevent him from insisting on the full Catholic claims. He tries to write with sweet reasonableness, and speaks of the ignorance and errors of non-Catholics more in sorrow than in anger. But readers of his book will wonder whether the ignorance and errors are only on one side.

Lovers of the occult and mysterious will surely be attracted by *The Ageless Way*, by Gothian (Dacres, 5s.). It attempts to explain life in terms of an evolutionary process in which humanity, having descended from spirit to matter, is now on the return journey towards the Kingdom of God though quite unconscious of the fact. To help man on his upward way this book has been written. It is a revelation of esoteric wisdom, and has much to say on methods of soul training. Evolution, Meditation, Hierarchies, Planes and Bodies, The Lord Buddha, Jesus Christ, Initiation, and the Future Life are among the subjects discussed, and sufficiently indicate the intentions and interests of the writer. He will no doubt find readers among the multitudes who have lost their moorings, but whether he can bring them again to a safe anchorage may be questioned.

Dr. E. L. Allen is theological lecturer in Durham University and is becoming well known as a wise and stimulating writer on religious subjects. His latest book, *Thou must Venture* (Nisbet, 7s. 6d.), will certainly add to his reputation. It is a series of studies in practical Christianity arranged under the three heads, "The Gospel of God", "The Gospel of Jesus Christ", and "Ourselves and the Gospel". Dr. Allen writes with the needs, circumstances, and perplexities of the ordinary man ever before his mind, and his sympathetic and knowledgeable treatment of them shows him to be a true shepherd of souls. There is a good deal of theology in the book, but it is set forth with such simplicity of insight and understanding that he who runs may read. Dr. Allen can make old themes live again, and never strays far from the centre.

W. B. Selbie.

Miss Margery Perham and Mr. J. Simmons are collaborators in *African Discovery* (Faber & Faber, 12s. 6d.), a work which contains many interesting selections. The editorial matter is brief but adequate, and there are a useful bibliography and maps. The book deals with the "classical age" of African discovery, beginning with Bruce's journey in 1768 and ending with the death of Livingstone in 1873. The varied selections from the travels of Bruce, Mungo Park, Clapperton and Lander, Baikie, Livingstone, Burton and Speke, Bader and Stanley, are both entertaining and informative. Miss Perham and Mr. Simmons are to be congratulated on a unique book.

Margaret Peel.

NEW EDITIONS.

A MAN has a right to his recreations, and Prof. S. E. Morison evidently enjoyed hugely his expeditions in the footsteps—though "footsteps" cannot be the correct word—of Christopher Columbus's Four Voyages. But Prof. Morison's field is 17th century America, and we grudge every moment he devotes to other pursuits, which are diverting in more sentences than one. *Christopher Columbus: Admiral of the Ocean Sea* (Oxford Press, 21s.) omits the notes and some pages of navigational data and summarizes one or two chapters of the 2-volume edition. The book is as thorough and as readable as all Dr. Morison's previous writings.

Is Christianity True? (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 10s. 6d.) is the 4th Edition of the correspondence between Mr. Arnold Lunn and Dr. C. E. M. Joad, first published in 1932. Dr. Joad contributes a new Introduction.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

Hibbert Journal (Jan.). An interesting number. Dr. Jacks finds in the Brains Trust an illustration of the "Brain Myth", and asks, "Why should brains be trusted, and for what?" The Headmaster of a County School has a good article on "Education Re-born". The Very Rev. J. S. MacArthur writes on F. W. H. Myers, Dr. S. A. Cook on "The Religion of Science and the Science of Religion", Dr. C. J. Wright on "The Humanisation of History", and Dr. Mellone surveys recent philosophy and theology.

Friends' Quarterly Examiner (First Month). "From the House of the Four Winds" deals with "General Smuts in London". Mr. E. B. Castle's "A Candle of Understanding" is a Presidential Address to the Friends' Guild of Teachers. The late John A. Hughes's "A Quaker Minister of Friendship" describes a South Yorkshire experiment.

International Review of Missions (Jan.). The Editors survey the year 1942, Dr. Kraemer's "The Riddle of History" discusses *Rom.* 9-11, the Rev. R. M. Clark examines "Theological Categories in the Indian Church", and there are useful reviews.

World Dominion (Jan.-Feb.). Glimpses of missionary enterprise in all parts of the world. The Soviet Government is said to be slowly modifying its policy in regard to religion. Sir William Dobbie is among the contributors.

Evangelical Quarterly (Jan.). The contents are more varied than usual. Dr. D. M. Baillie writes on "The Justification of Infant Baptism", Dr. J. T. Hornsby on "James Allen of Gayle", the Rev. R. G. Smith on "The Church and the Churches", and Dr. S. B. Babbage on Kierkegaard's *Unscientific Postscript.* Mr. F. F. Bruce continues his "Some Aspects of Greek Introduction".

Expository Times (Jan.-March). Noteworthy articles are Dr. H. G. Meecham's "The Theology of the Epistle to Diognetus" and the Rev. T. E. Bleiben's "The Synoptists' Interpretation of the Death of Christ". In "Human Reason and the Holy Spirit" the Rev. G. S. Hendry breaks a lance with Dr. John Baillie in defence of the Barthians.

Religions (Jan.). This is the quarterly journal of the Society for the Study of Religions (10s. 6d. *p.a.* post free). It contains articles by the Editor ("The Decay of Religious Faith and Worship in the Western World") and Mr. A. D. Howell Smith ("The Present Social Order and Religion").

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library (Dec.). Prof. Charlton writes on "Browning's Ethical Poetry" and the Editor on "Human Records". There are two articles on Greece, and Prof. Pear asks "Are There Human Instincts?" Dr. Samuel Krauss tells of "Two Hitherto Unknown Bible Versions in Greek", and Dr. I. J. Rosenthal has an appreciation of the Biblical exegesis of Saadya Gaon.

Harvard Theological Review (Oct.). 4 learned articles—Homer H. Dubs ("An Ancient Chinese Mystery Cult"), Conrad Wright ("Edwards and the Arminians on the Freedom of the Will"), Carl H. Kraeling ("The Episode of the Roman Standards at Jerusalem"), and Louis Finkelstein ("Pre-Maccabean Documents in the Passover Haggadah").

Anglican Theological Review (Oct.). Mr. Kraeling is represented here in an examination of Olmstead's Chronology of the Life of Jesus. Prof. W. N. Pittenger discusses "The Value of the Liberal Tradition in Historic Christianity", Prof. J. B.

Pratt "Three Trends in the Philosophy of Religion", and Mr. Sherman E. Johnson "The Episcopal Church and the Bible".

Religion in Life (Winter). Varied and entertaining. British contributors are Dr. J. A. Hutton and the Rev. L. D. Weatherhead. Dr. E. S. Brightman has a lively article on "The Versatile James", there are three important contributions on religious education, Prof. Johanson expounds Nels Ferré's theology, Dr. E. R. Hardy "The Limits of Discipline", and Dr. J. T. McNeill "Casuistry in the Puritan Age".

The Review of Religion (Nov.). 48 pp. of reviews and three articles—Prof. L. H. Gray's "Brythonic Christianity", Ananda K. Coomaraswamy's "On Being in One's Right Mind", and Prof. Fritz Marti's "Religion, Philosophy, and the College".

The Review and Expositor (Jan.). Many of the articles deal with the domestic issues of the Southern Baptist Seminary. Dr. E. A. McDowell's "Southern Churches and the Negroes" is informing. 48 pp. of Book Reviews.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE SOUTH INDIA UNITED CHURCH AND THE INDIAN CHRISTIAN HERITAGE.

DEAR MR. EDITOR,

Issues so great and grave are raised by my friend the Rev. H. V. Martin in his article "Church Union in South India and the Indian Christian Heritage" that some reply is essential. I think his statements about the Union Scheme are one-sided and unfair, but you have no space for detailed discussion of them, and I restrict myself to the underlying issue about the Indian Christian Heritage, only begging beforehand that brevity of statement be not mistaken for dogmatism. Only a long reply could deal adequately with the subject; what follows is merely the headlines of the argument, and qualifying clauses are omitted.

I challenge as endangering the future of the Christian religion in India the assumption that this heritage is Hinduism, even when somewhat idealized as here; and that the Christian Church must adapt itself to what is vaguely termed "Indian thought". In *any* land, Britain or China, Africa or India, the Church's heritage is God's self-revelation in those "mighty acts", centring in the incarnate life, death, and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, which created first Israel after the flesh and then the New Israel. When some Christians in the early centuries mistook Greek religion for their heritage and thought Christianity must be suited to it, the result was various forms of Gnosticism which came near to destroying Christianity. When some recent British Christians tried to suit Christianity to "modern science" they produced the kind of humanistic modernism which Mr. Martin himself has often attacked when expounding Karl Barth. When many German Christians lately thought their religious heritage was ancient Teutonic paganism and that Christianity must be suited to German thought, the result was a syncretism which is supporting the Nazis.

The Indian Church must not, to its own peril, take the wrong turning just now. Real indigenous Christianity will come by an unconscious process when for a century or two millions of Christians of Indian race have worked out what it means to serve the Lord Christ in India, and have found what must be rejected and what may be "baptized unto Christ". That is very different from treating Hinduism now as their religious heritage, and consciously adapting their Christianity to it.

The particular instance is Church organization. "Hinduism knows no Church government comparable to our Western system", says the article. True, because Hinduism knows no Church at all, and only a church-less

Christianity would be "suited to Indian thought". The present organization of the L.M.S., or the present worship of any village congregation in Anantapur, is just as foreign to "Indian thought" as the organization or worship of the proposed United Church of South India, yet it is not proposed to alter them on that account.

But *is* the organized Church peculiarly western, an accretion upon some originally intangible spiritual solidarity which was primitive Christianity? That is suggested, without evidence, by some of the Indians to whom Mr. Martin refers with apparent, but uncertain, approval. When St. Paul wrote his astonishing passages concerning the Body of Christ to new Christians in Corinth or Ephesus he did not think so, nor did he bid them suit themselves to "Greek thought", nor did he suggest that Holy Communion should be administered at home by the head of the house.

An Indian churchless unorganized Christianity, minimizing creed, sacraments, and ministry, and suiting itself to Hindu ways, is apparently the alternative to the proposed United Church. Hinduism would be very tolerant to it, as the octopus is tolerant to that which it sucks in and assimilates. But Mr. Martin, who knows these things as well as I do, has got so confused about the real meaning of indigenous Christianity that he is waving the green light where the red one is called for; there is grave danger ahead.

Sincerely yours,

G. E. PHILLIPS.

A KINK IN THE ACLAND ARGUMENT.

SIR,—In his article in the January issue of the *Congregational Quarterly* Sir Richard Acland arraigned the Churches for their past apathy in face of the miseries resulting from the disorders of our industrial system. He was surely right in pressing home our Lord's condemnation, "Inasmuch as ye did it not to these my brethren ye did it not to me". But there is a hiatus in his subsequent argument in which a proper Christian concern in these matters is held to involve of necessity the collective ownership of the means of production.

The manifesto put out a year ago in the name of the Anglican and Free Churches, with the title *Social Justice and Economic Reconstruction,* is quite as radical as Sir Richard in its statement of principles and quite as realist in their application; but it is more discriminating in distinguishing between the assertions which the Churches should make on the firm authority of their religious axioms and the technical deductions about which there is legitimate room for difference of opinion. It is vastly important to maintain these distinctions, otherwise the influence of Christian leadership will be discredited.

Incidentally, Sir Richard takes the statements of the Malvern Conference as the leading expression of authoritative Christian opinion today. That, of course, is not so. The Malvern Conference was an Anglican Conference and its President was careful to indicate its purely unofficial character. *Social Justice and Economic Reconstruction,* on the other hand, was issued with the full authority of the Commission officially appointed to speak on these matters, and the official denominational Committees contributed to its revision. It is important, therefore, to keep this statement in the forefront as by far the most responsible utterance on the subject.

That noted, I return to Sir Richard's argument, which I regard as claiming too much on a secondary point and saying too little on a primary one. The primary point is the principle that every form of Industrial Association permitted in this country should be held responsible by public

opinion and (as far as possible) by public law for any action that would undermine the economic rights of other individuals or other nations. The secondary point is the precise form of industrial organization which would fulfil this requirement. I will deal with this latter point first.

It is common ground between Sir Richard and the Churches' statement that our present industrial structure is generally guilty of this kind of wrong. It is designed to foster the sectional financial interest of proprietors at the expense of, and largely in disregard of, many fundamental interests of employees and the public. But that is not to say that every form of private enterprise must necessarily commit these wrongs or that a publicly owned industry will necessarily not commit them.

I just mention, without dwelling on, an incidental point that weighs heavily with many of those who are just as keen as Sir Richard Acland on Social Justice. This is the fear of lethargy, rigidity, and timidity in the management of industry by Government officials as a factor likely to outweigh the advantages of a collectivist system by reducing its output. I agree with the desirability of the picture Sir Richard draws of an industry in which it is possible to appeal to all ranks to do their best for the community without suspicion that it will not be the public so much as the proprietors who will reap the gain. But who will deny that the quest for private prestige and preferment exerts the same kind of drag upon public-spirited service in the public services as private profit does in private enterprise? On balance I think Sir Richard's hopes may be realized; but not simply as the by-product of a struggle for collective ownership.

On the contrary, there are forms of Public Utility Trust and experiments in the progressive co-ordination of private enterprise with public policy, and proposals for a more widespread transformation of private companies into National Companies (see the brochure on this subject by Alderman Philip Robinson of Chesterfield), which have most if not all the advantages claimed for public ownership, without its technical difficulties. And the development from private to social control might take place with far less friction and far less sacrifice of valuable experience if effected along these well tried lines which find so much support in British feeling and tradition.

New forms of ownership and control will only give the desired results if they are the expression of a new principle and if that principle has been accepted and acclaimed as a principle before it is applied with a technique. That principle is the principle that all industry should be made to conform to the requirement that the first charge upon the total output of all industries taken together shall be a standard of life for all citizens appropriate to the economic resources of the day (and that means something far ahead of the present wage minima in backward industries), and the first charge upon its organization shall be a recognized status in industry for every worker, which he can only lose by proved personal fault. If Christian spokesmen can win public spirit to that principle, its application can be left to technical discussions by industrialists—with as little interference as possible from politicians. When that point is reached it may be found that the crux of the whole matter is not the internal structure of each separate industry but the means for their due balance and co-ordination—a field in which private enterprise and government departments have both got a great deal still to learn from one another and from elsewhere.

Yours truly,

MALCOLM SPENCER.